

VOLUME XXVI

NUMBER 3

*July 1931*

---

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

---

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

PAUL SHOREY, *Managing Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER  
CARL DARLING BUCK

GORDON JENNINGS LAING  
HENRY W. PRESCOTT

GERTRUDE SMITH  
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM ARTHUR HEIDEL, *Wesleyan University*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Fala University*  
WALLACE M. LINDSAY, *University of St. Andrews*  
ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, *University of Chicago*

FRANK JUSTUS MILLER, *University of Chicago*  
JOHN C. BOLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*  
CHARLES FORSTER SMITH, *University of Wisconsin*  
ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXVI

CONTENTS FOR JULY 1931

No. 3

Lucan and His Roman Critics . . . . .	By Eva Matthews Sanford	233
Horace and Octavian ( <i>Chr. I. 2</i> ) . . . . .	By Jefferson Elmore	258
The Character Treatment of Inorganic Roles in Roman Comedy . . . . .	By Ortho L. Wilner	264
Two Unreported Persius Manuscripts . . . . .	By Dorothy M. Robathan	284
The <i>Cleitophon</i> of Plato . . . . .	By C. M. A. Grube	302
Notes and Discussions . . . . .		309

H. T. WADE-GREY: Strategoi in the Samian War (with an unpublished inscription).—GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING: Homeric Notes.—H. N. COUCH: Prokynasis and Abasement in Aeschylus.—JAMES B. DUNLAP: Tribal Boundaries in Belgic Gaul.—JACOB A. O. LARSEN: *Quinquennialis Perpetuus* as Title for a Municipal Magistrate.—PAUL SHOREY: *Plato Sophist* 236 C and *Love* 668 A ff.—HENRY C. MONTGOMERY: A Conjectural Restoration of *IG*, II, 2, 966 B.—HOLMES V. M. DENNIS 3d: A Note on Horace and Du Bellay.

## Book Reviews

327

S. A. COKE, F. E. ACOCK, M. P. CHARLESWORTH (Eds.): *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Larsen).—C. M. BOWRA: *Tradition and Design in the "Iliad"* (Bolling).—J. BIDRÉ: *La vie de l'Empereur Julien* (Wright).—A. WILLE: *Iphigénie à Aulis* (Lange).—DAVID M. ROBINSON: *Excavations at Olynthus, Parts III and IV* (Johnson).—JAMES LOEB (Tr.): *Auguste Couat: Alexandrian Poetry under the First Three Ptolemies, 384-222 B.C.* (Shorey).—OTTO GRADENWITZ: *Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Book).—PAUL SHOREY: *Plato, The Republic, with an English Translation* (P. S.).—ALFRED R. BELLINGER: *Catalogue of the Coins Found at Corinth, 1886* (Johnson).—DESCENDUS AVERNO: *Fourteen Woodcuts Reproduced from Sebastian Brant's "Vergil"* (Shorey).—MONUMENTA *Antica Minora Antiqua* (Johnson).—EDMUND GROAG: *Hannibal als Politiker* (Larsen).—EVA M. SANFORD (Tr.): *On the Government of God*. (Shorey).

**Classical Philology** is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Dominican Republic, Canary Islands, El Salvador, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, Haiti, Uruguay, Paraguay, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa Islands, Balearic Islands, Spain, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 15 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.15), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 25 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.25), on single copies, 6 cents (total \$1.31). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

### The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 10s. 2d. each; single copies, including postage, 6s. 4d. each.

For Japan: THE MARUEN COMPANY, LTD., Tokyo.

For China: THE COMMERCIAL PRESS, LTD., Freshen Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, \$4.00; single copies, \$1.25, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, on yearly subscriptions 25 cents, on single copies 6 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the receipt stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of *Classical Philology*, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

Y

AN

to

Veronica

ity

No. 3

233

258

264

284

302

300

327

ty of  
year,  
stage  
public  
Rica,  
ands,  
and  
tries  
are  
afts.

mas,  
clud-

plen,  
cents,  
oub-  
took

2.25-

and

912.  
on





# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXVI

JULY 1931

Number 3

## LUCAN AND HIS ROMAN CRITICS

BY EVA MATTHEWS SANFORD

A CONTROVERSY of a subjective nature, in which the opposing sides rest their contentions on different interpretations of the terms involved, is scarcely susceptible of a final decision. Yet such arguments are perennially popular, especially in literary criticism. The dispute raised on the publication of Lucan's long hexameter account of the civil wars has not been settled. We are not likely now to discover whether Lucan actually was a historian or a poet by the strictest canons of his age. To conclude, as some modern sages do, that he was neither scarcely aids the solution of the problem. But it has pleased many critics to wage this war of words, not only in antiquity but in recent years. Lucan's confident prophecy to Caesar<sup>1</sup> has been only partially fulfilled of late: Caesar's wars are still being read by many, but Lucan's *Pharsalia* seems more likely to be doomed to darkness by the present age than by any other since he wrote. The controversy that his work aroused among contemporary critics remains, however, as a valuable index of certain aspects of literary taste and criticism in the Silver Age— a period which recent sympathetic studies may restore to a higher place than it has sometimes occupied in the general estimation.

In spite of the many discussions of the case from as many points of

<sup>1</sup> *Pharsalia* ix. 985-86:

"venturi me teque legent: Pharsalia nostra  
vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo."

I cite Lucan's work throughout as the *Pharsalia*, not in defense of that title, but to avoid ambiguity, in view of the frequent references to the poem of Petronius *On the Civil War*.

view,<sup>1</sup> there seems to be room for a study of the workings of Roman criticism in this comparatively well-documented controversy, and of the attitude toward Lucan's real attainments implied in it, leaving aside, as far as possible, judgments based on the present canons of poetic and historical composition.

A résumé of the evidence for the active discussion of Lucan's work, and of its historical or poetic character, from the time of its publication until modern times, is a necessary prelude to any further study. Eumolpus' famous statement in the *Satyricon* of Petronius, of the whole duty of an epic poet, and of the distinction between history and true epic, is followed by a poem on the Civil War so clearly intended to show what a proper attention to *deorum ministeria* could do to increase the epic value of the theme that the allusion to the Lucan controversy could hardly be questioned even without additional evidence.<sup>2</sup> The much-discussed question of Petronius' own point of view will be considered later. In the meantime we may at least take Eumolpus as one type of the critics who fed upon the case, and his demand for more *fabulosum sententiarum tormentum* than he finds in the historical epics of his time serves as a warning that we are not to judge the question in the light of our own taste.

<sup>1</sup> Among these may be mentioned particularly the accounts of Lucan's work in Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* (Munich, 1913), II, 2, and in the article of F. Marx, in Pauly-Wissowa, Vol. II, cols. 2226-36, both of which give valuable summaries of the chief studies of the question; F. T. Baldwin, *The "Bellum Civile" of Petronius*, (New York, 1911); A. Collignon, *Etude sur Pétrone* (Paris, 1893), pp. 109-226; Mössler, *Commentatio de Petronii poemate* (Breslau, 1842); *Quaestionum Petronianarum specimen* (Hirschberg, 1857, 1865, 1870); Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, 1892), III, 91-125; E. Westerburg, "Petron und Lucan," *Rheinisches Museum*, XXXVIII (1883), 92-96; V. Ussani, "Questioni Petroniani," *Studi italiani*, XIII, (1905), 1-51; J. Ziehen, "Lucan als Historiker," *Berichte d. freien deutschen Hochstiftes z. Frankfurt a.M.*, VI (1890), 50-71. Souriau's *De deorum ministeriis in Pharsalia* (Paris, 1885) and Ussani's *Sul valore storico del poema Lucaneo* (Rome, 1903) have unfortunately not been available, though a clear idea of their general conclusions may be gained from discussions and reviews. Other useful contributions to the question will be cited in later notes on special topics. The controversy seems to have aroused more interest in Germany than elsewhere, and to have served especially as a field for doctoral dissertations, which has led to rather more emphasis on the support of a given thesis than is altogether desirable.

<sup>2</sup> Petronius *Satyricon* 118: "Ecce belli civilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit, nisi plenus litteris, sub onere labetur. Non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipitandus est liber spiritus, ut potius furentis animi vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides."

Martial's well-known gift-card motto<sup>1</sup> to accompany a volume of Lucan suggests that the bookseller could furnish a ready answer to the question. We may picture his scorn of a reader who was too stupid to know how to classify a book whose irregular lines marked it as poetry whether you read it or not. The foolish discussions of the customers were not to be taken seriously except as they affected the sales of the book.

The rhetorical qualities of Lucan's style have always attracted notice, and Quintilian suggested that the *Pharsalia* was more appropriate for the instruction of orators than poets.<sup>2</sup> There is sufficient evidence that Lucan's qualities as a rhetorician would be sure to be considered by his contemporary critics, but Quintilian's verdict will be seen to have some bearing also on the main issue.

In the time of Servius, Lucan and his contemporaries were usually reckoned among the *auctores neoterici*, and seem to have been subjected to sharper criticism than the true classics, a phenomenon by no means unfamiliar.<sup>3</sup> Regardless of the question whether it was due to Servius, as Wessner maintains, that Lucan came to be reckoned again among the *auctores idonei* for use in schools, he certainly played a prominent part in keeping alive the traditional question. In his commentary on a passage in which Virgil touched lightly on a tale not susceptible of detailed treatment *per legem artis poeticae*, Servius added that Lucan did not deserve to be ranked among poets, since he appeared to have composed a history, not a poem.<sup>4</sup> This statement was surely somewhat irrelevant unless we assume that the question was still current. His verdict is repeated by Isidore of Seville in almost the same words, with a reflection also of the conviction held by Eumolpus and his ilk, that a straightforward account was less suitable

<sup>1</sup> *Epigramm.* xiv. 194: "Sunt quidam qui me dicant non esse poetam, sed qui me vendit bibliopola putat."

<sup>2</sup> *Inst. or.* x. 1. 90: "magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus."

<sup>3</sup> See the discussion of this point and of Lucan's influence in the late classical period in P. Wessner, "Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern," *Phil. Wochenschrift*, XLIX (1929), 10-11, cols. 296-303, 328-35. With this should be contrasted H. J. Thompson, "Lucan, Statius and Juvenal in the Early Centuries," *Class. Quart.*, XXII (1928), 24-27.

<sup>4</sup> Servius, on *Aeneid* i. 382: "hoc loco per transitum tangit historiam, quam per legem artis poeticae aperte non potest ponere. . . . Lucanus namque ideo in numero poetarum esse non meruit, quia videtur historiam composuisse, non poema."

for the poet than *ambages*.<sup>1</sup> Any statement sponsored by Isidore and Servius could not fail to be impressed on the mediaeval mind. The *Commenta Bernensia* echo the same idea in slightly different words, which seem again to reflect the feeling that the poet's tale must be more involved than that of the historian.<sup>2</sup>

In the Middle Ages the verdict of Servius was frequently echoed. Jordanes alludes to it somewhat irrelevantly in a passage copied in turn by Freculphus Lexoviensis.<sup>3</sup> Aside from such direct or secondary reminiscences of Servius' dictum the general tendency among mediaeval historians seems to have been simply to quote Lucan as a historical poet, calling him usually *poeta* or *vates*, but using his work like that of other poets as a valid source of historical materials. Lucan proved a more versatile source of quotations than most other classical poets however. If we had to reconstruct his *Pharsalia* on the basis of citations in certain authors, as Hugh of St. Victor or Hrabanus Maurus, we should be forced to the conclusion that it was a didactic poem on snakes. A different choice of citations might lead with equal cogency to the theory that it was a metrical geography.<sup>4</sup> Richer's account of Gerbert's curriculum for rhetorical study includes under the general heading of poets Virgil, Statius and Terence as poets; Juvenal, Persius, and Horace as satirists; and Lucan as historiographer.<sup>5</sup> It is to be noted that the *historiographus* is here considered as one type of *poeta*.

The mention of Lucan's work in the twelfth-century curriculum of

<sup>1</sup> *Origines* viii. 7. 10: "officium autem poetae in eo est ut ea, quae vere gesta sunt, in alias species obliquis figurationibus cum decore aliquo conversa transducunt. unde et Lucanus ideo in numero poetarum non ponitur, quia videtur historias composuisse, non poema."

<sup>2</sup> *Comm. Bern.* on *Pharsalia* i. 1 (ed. Usener [Leipzig, 1869], p. 9): "Lucanus dicitur a plerisque non esse in numero poetarum, quis omnino historiam sequitur, quod poeticae arti non convenit."

Peter notes that the *Commenta* in general show their compiler's conception of Lucan's work as primarily historical (H. Peter, *Geschichtliche Litteratur über die röm. Kaiserzeit* [Leipzig, 1897], II, 209).

<sup>3</sup> *Getica* v. 43: "Quorum studium fuit primum inter alias gentes vicinas arcum intendere nervis, Lucano plus storico quam poeta testante, 'Armeniosque arcus Geticis intendite nervis.'" See Freculphus *Chronicon* i. 2. 16.

<sup>4</sup> For the use of Lucan by twelfth-century historians see C. H. Haskins, *Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 1927), pp. 110, 148-49. I hope to publish in the near future a study of various aspects of Lucan's popularity in the Middle Ages, which will deal more fully with the topics briefly suggested in this portion of the present paper.

<sup>5</sup> Richer *Historiae* iii. 47 (ed. Waitz, *Scr. rer. ger.* [Hannover 1877], pp. 101-2).



the *Sacerdos ad altare* presents a curious reflection of the difference between the *cliché* of Servius and the current practice of the schools. Any clear distinction between history and poetry was surely far from the mind of the man who wrote: "Deinde satiricos et ystoriographos legat, ut vicia etiam in minori etate addiscat esse fugienda et nobilia gesta eorum desideret imitari. A thebaide iocunda transeat ad divinam eneida, nec negligat vatem quem Corduba genuit qui non solum civilia bella describit sed et intestina."<sup>1</sup> The gloss on this passage overlooked not only the inclusion of Statius and Virgil with Lucan as *ystoriographi*, which Servius would not have countenanced, but also the mention of Lucan as *vates*, and imitated Servius mechanically: "et nota quod Lucanus non ponitur in numero poetarum quia historiam composuit et non poema." Yet there is evidence that the same man, and one highly distinguished in literary and educational lines, wrote both the text and the gloss. The question whether Lucan was a historian or a poet was sure to become artificial in an age when the general practice within and without the schools was to turn any worthy subject into verse for its better adornment, and when a basic principle of education was that proper instruction in the *ars metrica* would produce poets. The too-frequent application of this principle has been partly responsible for failure to recognize the true poetic gift when it appeared in the mass of metrical exercises that survive from the mediaeval schools and their former pupils.

Otto of Freising, who cited Lucan fairly often, joined him with Virgil as precedents for the historian to leave the lower ground of simple narrative in quest of more lofty and philosophical discourse. Apparently he did not see in Lucan's poem that lack of the fabulous element that Eumolpus censured.<sup>2</sup> Joseph of Exeter imitated Lucan extensively in metre, style, etc. A recent study of his work tells how being bound by the "rules of the game" to let gods and goddesses

<sup>1</sup> See C. H. Haskins, *Studies in Mediaeval Science* (Cambridge, 1927), p. 372 and n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Gesta Friderici* (ed. Hofmeister, *Scr. rer. ger.* [Hannover, 1912], p. 12): "Nec, si a plana hystorica dictione ad evagandum oportunitate nacta ad altiora velut phylosophica acumina attollatur oratio, preter rem eiusmodi estimabuntur, dum et id ipsum Romani imperii prerogativae non sit extraneum rebus simplicioribus altiora interponere. Nam et Lucanus, Virgilius caeterique Urbis scriptores, non solum res gestas, sed etiam fabulosas, sive more pastorum vel colonorum summissius vel principum dominorumque orbis altius narrando, stilum tamen frequenter ad intima quaedam phylosophiae secreta attingenda sustulerunt."

figure in his tale, he either "makes them a peg on which to hang satirical digressions" or uses them as vehicles for exposition of the childishness of heathen mythology.<sup>1</sup> The Christian writer thus outdid the Stoic in his attitude toward the divine machinery of epic poetry; instead of omitting it, he made use of it for its own confusion. Without having read Joseph's epic, it would be hazardous to conjecture that he was aware of Lucan's precedent for ignoring the rules of the game, but found his own adaptation of the rules more interesting.

This case suggests, however, as do many others, that something of Lucan's popularity in the Middle Ages was due to the very quality for which he was most censured in the classical period—his omission of disquietingly pagan elements. The substitutes employed appealed most readily to later men whose religion had not made them less fond of superstition and the supernatural than were his original readers.

The *accessus* to Lucan's work, which appear with considerable frequency in manuscripts of the fourteenth century and later, show the persistence of the question, affording at the same time interesting indications of the sort of information given to students of the period by their teachers' lectures. On the flyleaf of MS Ottobonianus Latinus 1712, in the Vatican Library, a passage in such an *accessus* is double-scored and marked *Nota*, showing its use by at least one teacher of classical literature. Though a hole in the parchment has destroyed a part of the text, its significance is clear:

Iuvenalis est purus satiricus. Terentius purus comoedus. Homerus [*sic*] in odis purus lyricus. Non est iste [*sc. Lucanus*] purus historiographus sed poeta et historiographus. Nam . . . historiam suam prosaice et non . . . fingit. Unde non poeta simplex dicitur sed poeta et historiographus. Nam si affationes inducit non ex suapte parte sed ex aliorum partibus dicit.

The author of the *accessus* to Lucan in MS Ottobonianus Latinus 1881, written in A.D. 1421, considers Lucan not poet and historian, but historiographer alone, yet one who did not use the true historical form:

Iste autor historiographus est et utitur ordine artificiali quod non deberet dici romanam historiam [fol. 3].

On the other hand, the *accessus* on the first page of MS Vaticanus Latinus 1519 upholds the classification of Lucan as a poet:

<sup>1</sup> W. B. Sedgwick, "The *Bellum Troianum* of Joseph of Exeter," *Speculum*, V, 1 (1930), 60.

Modus scribendi est poeticus nam metrice scribit et fingit artes magicas et alia quae faciunt Lucanum esse poetam . . . quamvis Quintilianus dicat Lucanum magis ab oratoribus quam a poetis imitandus nam artificiosis orationibus volumen suum exornat librorum.

These three statements are typical of those made by the later commentators, and show clearly their dependence, however indirect, on the ancient accounts of the question, especially in Quintilian and Servius. In these *accessus* the question whether Lucan was historian or poet, or both, seems, however, artificial in comparison with the more personal interest taken in the moral purpose of his work. To the question *cui parti philosophiae supponitur?* the answer is unanimous, *ethice sive morali quia de moribus tractat* (Ottobonianus Latinus 1881, fol. 3). Or, to quote in more detail from MS Vaticanus Latinus 1519, folio 1:

cuius finis est ut ex exemplo aliorum cognoscamus appetendam esse pacem et discordiam evitandam . . . finis autem est ut ex exemplo cesaris et pompeii et romanorum discamus omnes evitare discordias. vel etiam finis est ut ipse poeta ex hoc volumine sempiternam vitam consequatur.

A decided departure from the traditional attitudes toward Lucan's work was that of Joseph Scaliger. As a pioneer in historical criticism, almost the highest praise he could bestow was the statement that a given man could write history, whereas he expressed his willingness to give up Lucan, Statius *et tous ces garçons-là*, in exchange for the works of Ennius. Far from reckoning Lucan as a historian, he found his style most violent and terrible, and so lacking in restraint that *il n'a sceu que c'estoit que faire un Poème*.<sup>1</sup> The verdict that Lucan was neither historian nor poet, but a violent rhetorician, fittingly ushered in the modern age.

For the modern period, with which we are not here directly concerned, the example of Peter Burmann's Preface to his edition of the *Pharsalia* published at Leyden in 1740 may suffice. He approved what he considered the general judgment of learned men from Lucan's time to his own day, in ejecting Lucan from the band of poets and consigning him to the rabble of historians:

Lucanum Poetarum choro esse ejiciendum, et ad Historicorum turbam ablegandum, quia res gestas ordine et serie temporum digestas versibus enarravit, non male eos judicasse, facile mihi persuadere possum.

<sup>1</sup> *Prima Scaligerana* (Amsterdam, 1740), pp. 85, 116.

Lucan's prime fault, as Burmann saw it, was in choosing a subject too near his own times; a poet should be free to make and form his own materials—*de certa facti veritate laborare non decet*. Eumolpus' criticism is quoted in this connection, and Virgil's choice of subject in the *Aeneid* is cited by way of contrast. Burmann saw cause for regret in Lucan's influence on the would-be poets of his own day, who thought they surpassed Virgil since they did not blush to rival the frenzy of Lucan, producing what was neither history nor poetry.

To return to the inception of the controversy, one realizes at once that widespread interest in the argument about the *Pharsalia* was entirely natural at the time of its publication. It had many qualities sure to appeal both to popular and to cultivated tastes, in an age when rhetoricians flourished, and had the additional lure of a striking variation from the usual technique of epic poetry. How did it happen that the question survived to be immortalized by Servius? It is possible, of course, that his suggestion was prompted simply by his acquaintance with earlier mentions of the case, perhaps including materials now lost. If Wessner's theory of the comparative neglect of Lucan's work in the interim is to be accepted, this would seem to be the natural solution. If, however, the neglect of the Silver Age writers was then less complete than he supposes, we may look to the schools and especially the rhetoricians for the means of keeping the question alive. Certainly they were largely responsible for its prominence in the first and second centuries, after the initial stir had begun to subside. The schools needed subjects for debate and for learned comment, and this one offered many opportunities for the pedant to display his erudition before his students, and even to call on them to compose a historical treatment of Lucan's subject in a more orthodox style. It is tempting to see in Eumolpus' critique the wordy mouthings of such a pedant, more skilled in diatribe than in the true poetic art, and in Petronius' poem *On the Civil War*, with its "Virgilianizing of Lucan," a re-working of the school exercise of a talented pupil attempting a bit maliciously to test the teacher's real discrimination.<sup>1</sup> I will not press the

<sup>1</sup> The poem has frequently been described as a school exercise. See especially Collignon, *loc. cit.* I do not, however, agree with Collignon that the poem might as well have been on any other subject if Petronius had had such an exercise at hand (*ibid.*, p. 226). Only a subject already aired by critics and thoroughly familiar to the readers of the *Satyricon* would afford so vivid a picture of Eumolpus' ravings, which may best



point, but if the scene is a parody at all, it seems to parody the critic's stand, rather than the longer poem which it so sincerely imitates in most points except those for which any Orbilius, or Eumolpus, would be watching—the use of *deorum ministeria* and the metrical technique.

Evidence for the place of Lucan in the schools and in public recitations and discussions is by no means lacking. Quintilian, as we have seen, recommended the *Pharsalia* for study in the oratorical schools; Tacitus grouped Lucan with Virgil and Horace as authors to be studied for their poetical influence on an orator's style.<sup>1</sup>

Such study of the poets was a natural object of the *praelectio*. Martial's epigram cited above may well be, as Genthe suggested, an echo of the favorite educational device of the rhetorical schools, of which the poet spoke more distinctly in his warning to Musa:

An iuvat ad tragicos soccum transferre cothurnos,  
Aspera vel paribus bella tonare modis,  
Praelegant ut tumidus rauca te voce magister  
Oderit et grandis virgo bonusque puer?<sup>2</sup>

Quintilian's discussion of the *praelectio* as a method of school instruction suggests that this exercise, if handled properly, and not as a mere task of reading and vocabulary study, would involve just such questions as the classification of the *Pharsalia*.<sup>3</sup> How important a part this exercise might play in the curriculum is indicated by the fragmentary

---

be described by a less complimentary interpretation of his desideratum for true poetry, that it be *furentis animi vaticinatio*. One may note in this connection that Burmann, upholding Eumolpus against Lucan, applies the term *furens* to the author of the *Pharsalia*. Collignon's discussion of Petronius' "Lucanizing of Virgil" in the *Troiae halosis* and his general comment on the latter piece (pp. 134-49) are of considerable value for any study of the purpose of the poem *On the Civil War*.

<sup>1</sup> *Dialogus* 20: "exigitur enim iam ab oratore etiam poeticus decor, non Accii aut Pacuvii veterino inquinatus, sed ex Horatii et Virgilii et Lucani sacrario prolatus."

<sup>2</sup> *Epigramm.* viii. 3. 13-16. Cf. A. Genthe, *De M. Annaei Lucani vita et scriptis* (Berlin, 1859), pp. 82-94. See also Martial *op. cit.* i. 35. 1-3:

"Versus scribere me parum severos,  
Nec quos praelegat in scholis magister,  
Corneli, quereris. . . ."

<sup>3</sup> *Inst. or.* xi. 5. 4: "praelectio quae in hoc adhibetur, ut facile atque distincte pueri scripta oculis sequantur, etiam illa, quae vim cuiusque verbi, si quod minus usitatum incidat, docet, multum infra rhetoris officium existimanda est. At demonstrare virtutes vel, si quando ita incidat, vitia, id professionis eius atque promissi, quo se magistrum eloquentiae pollicetur, maxime proprium est."

eulogy of the teacher's profession pronounced by a once-famous orator, earning his living in exile by teaching:

Bone Iuppiter, quam imperatorium, quam regium est sedere a suggestu praecipientem bonos mores et sacrarum studia litterarum, iam carmina praelegentem, quibus ora mentesque formentur, iam sentiis variis sensus excitantem, iam exemplis. . . .<sup>1</sup>

An echo of the violent differences of opinion that must have developed among the more gifted pupils in the rhetorical schools as a result of the topics taken up in connection with the *praelectio* is seen in the case of Persius. Even if the account in the *Vita Persii* of Lucan's extravagant praise of his fellow-student's work is an interpolation,<sup>2</sup> we may see the difference between the unbounded enthusiasm of the one and the more chaste and sober judgment of the other, by comparing this incident with Persius' disclaimer of divine inspiration in his verse, and of any sudden access of genius.<sup>3</sup> It is noteworthy that Persius began to write satires *vehementer*, directly after leaving the schools. His attacks on recent poets and orators would seem to have been directed in large part against Lucan and his supporters, but probably on considerations of taste and style differing from the popular fixation on the rôle of the gods and heroes in epic poetry.<sup>4</sup> How fundamentally different Persius and Lucan were in their reactions toward their schooldays is illustrated by their attitude toward the younger Cato. Lucan conceived such admiration for that favorite sub-

<sup>1</sup> P. Annii Flori *Vergilius orator an poeta* (ed. Rossbach in his edition of L. Annaeus Florus [Teubner, 1896], p. 187). This paragraph concludes the fragment of the Preface to the main discussion, which is not now preserved.

<sup>2</sup> *Vita Persii* 5: "Lucanus mirabatur adeo scripta Flacci, ut vix se retineret recitante eo clamare, quae ille faceret esse vera poemata, sua ludos." Cf. O. Jahn, *Prolegomena in Persium* (Leipzig, 1843), pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> *Sat.* i. 1-3:

"Nec fonte labra prolui caballino  
nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnaso  
memini, ut repente sic poeta prodirem. . . ."

It will be seen later that Martial confers on Lucan the inspiration of Helicon and Pieria as well, but, by some oversight, not Pirene. Eumolpus shared Persius' distrust of sudden accesses of poetic frenzy: "multos . . . carmen decepit. Nam ut quisque versum pedibus instruxit sensumque teneriorem verborum ambitu intexit, putavit se continuo in Heliconem venisse" (Petronius *op. cit.* 118).

<sup>4</sup> Suetonius *Vita Persii* 19: "Sed mox ut a schola magistrisque divertit lecto Lucilii libro decimo vehementer satiras componere instituit, cuius libri principium imitatus est, sibi primo mox omnibus detractus, cum tanta recentium poetarum et oratorum insectatione, ut etiam Neronem illius temporis principem culpavit."

ject of schoolboy declamations that he made him one of the most striking figures in his poem; the most quoted lines of the *Pharsalia* deal with the character of Cato. But Persius never forgot how, as a boy, he daubed his eyes with olive oil to avoid the hated ordeal of reciting Cato's dying words. The picture of his anxious father, with the friends brought along to hear the boy's efforts, suggests another line of influence from the schools to the adult public, in addition to individual reminiscences of earlier training.<sup>1</sup> Persius seems to have been unaffected by the current enthusiasm for historical characters,<sup>2</sup> and his fastidious taste shrank from a task "that no sane master would praise much," but for which the applause was sure to be forthcoming.

Whether such a question as that of Lucan's classification was ever the subject of students' exercises I cannot discover. While the historical subjects most popular in declamations in the schools correspond well with his choice of incident and characters,<sup>3</sup> the lists of *declamationes* do not seem to include literary criticism of recent works. Learned discussions in adult circles must have played a more important part in causing and continuing such a controversy as this. Suetonius tells us that Crates Mallotes was held responsible for establishing at Rome the habit of literary discussion.<sup>4</sup> He ascribes to Caecilius Epirota the initiation of the *praelectio* on the work of modern poets.<sup>5</sup> And, most important for the present study, he recalls the public readings and discussions of Lucan's poems, together with the issue of editions good and bad.<sup>6</sup> The connection between the *praelectio* and the

<sup>1</sup> Persius *Sat.* iii. 44-47:

"saepe oculos, memini, tangebam parvus olivo,  
grandia si nollem morituri verba Catonis  
discere non sano multum laudanda magistro,  
quae pater adductis sudans audiret amicis."

Seneca also recalls the popularity of Cato in school declamations. *Ep.* iii.3. 5: "Decantatae in omnibus scholis fabulae istae sunt: iam mihi, cum ad contemnendam mortem ventum fuerit, Catonem narrabis."

<sup>2</sup> See Peter, *op. cit.*, I, 71.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. R. Kohl, "De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis," *Rhetorische Studien* (Paderborn, 1915), Teil IV; Suetonius *De rhet.* 1.

<sup>4</sup> *De gramm.* 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 16: "Primus dicitur Latine ex tempore disputasse, primusque Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse."

<sup>6</sup> *De poetis; vita Lucani*: "poemata eius etiam praelegi memini, confici vero ac proponi venalia non tantum operose et diligenter sed et inepte quoque."

demand for copies is not merely a matter of sentence structure, as Martial had shown before. Wessner suggests that Lucan's publishers made use of the public *praelectio* of his works to stimulate sales—a foretaste of modern advertising methods.<sup>1</sup> How difficult it was to avoid not only pirating of editions, such as those Suetonius mentioned, but pirated recitations as well, is abundantly illustrated by Martial's complaints.<sup>2</sup>

The popularity of Lucan's poem for the *praelectio* outside of the schools gives no aid in the question of its classification, for the younger Pliny cites historical works together with the different types of poetic composition as commonly recited, in his defense of his own practice of reading his orations for his friends' verdict.<sup>3</sup>

At least two other Roman controversies may be traced which indicate the popularity of this type of discussion. Granius Licinianus, who wrote in a dry and difficult style, without rhetorical decoration, but was prone to emphasize wonders and marvels at the cost of matters of real historical importance, held that Sallust should be read not as a historian but as an orator. In view of the character of the fragments of Licinianus' work, one would expect some interesting replies to his estimate.<sup>4</sup> Since several of Lucan's leading characteristics are included in his criticism of Sallust, we may conclude that if Licinianus ventured any judgment about Lucan's standing, he joined those who classified him neither as a poet nor as a historian but as a *rhetor*. It is rather curious that Licinianus in the second century A.D. thought rhetoric a bar to true historical writing, while Cicero had judged that the earlier writers of Roman affairs were not historians because their works lacked rhetorical ornament.<sup>5</sup>

A more difficult controversy to explain than that about the character of Lucan's or Sallust's work is the dispute whether Virgil was an

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, col. 298.

<sup>2</sup> *Epigrams* i. 29, 53, 63, 66, 72.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vii. 17: "A quibus libenter requisierim, cur concedant, si concedant tamen, historiam debere recitari, quae non ostentationi, sed fidei veritatisque componitur, cur tragoediam . . . cur lyrica. . . . At horum recitatio usu iam recepta est."

<sup>4</sup> Peter, *op. cit.*, I, 130-31: "Sallustii opus nobis occurrit, sed nos, ut instituimus, moras et non urgentia omitemus. nam Sallustium non ut historicum puto sed ut oratorem legendum. nam et tempora reprehendit sua et delicta carpit et contiones inserit et dat in censum loca, montes, flumina et hoc genus amoena et culta et comparat disserendo."

<sup>5</sup> *De oratore* ii. 12. 52-53.



orator or a poet. Servius, it is true, is justifiably preoccupied with the task of distinguishing the historical, rhetorical, and purely poetic elements in Virgil's style, but that seems as far as it is possible to carry such a distinction in his case. It would seem to be a more artificial controversy than either of the others. But Servius' tale of the use that Titianus and Calvus made of Virgil's poems in the teaching of rhetoric may indicate the nature of its origin.<sup>1</sup> Only a portion of the Preface of the *Vergilius orator an poeta* of Publius Annius Florus, probably the well-known poet of Hadrian's circle,<sup>2</sup> is preserved, and this gives no clue to the argument itself. Something of its character, however, may be gathered from the fact that the poet who composed it put it in the mouth of a famous orator, earning his living in exile by teaching, and finding the *praelectio* of the poets his particular pleasure. The combination makes the loss of the discourse particularly unfortunate; it would have been a useful addition to our materials on Roman literary controversy.

Macrobius gives a pleasant glimpse of the character that this theme might assume among friends, and proves either the continued prevalence of the discussion or its later revival, as Servius does in the Lucan question. After a reading from Virgil, all unanimously murmured that Virgil should be considered as much an orator as a poet, for his close observation of the rhetorical art. So the question arose whether the would-be orator would do better to study Cicero or Virgil. Eusebius refused to decide between two such names but pointed out that Virgil's rhetorical art was *multiplex et multiformis*, by contrast with the *unus eloquentiae tenor* of Cicero, and that Virgil was the one author in whose work all four types of eloquence were to be found.<sup>3</sup>

A controversy as to the character of the work of so highly honored

<sup>1</sup> Servius, on *Aeneid* x. 18: "O PATER O HOMINUM et Titianus et Calvus, qui themata omnia de Vergilio elicerunt et deformatunt ad dicendi usum, in exemplo controversiarum has duas posuerunt adlocutiones."

<sup>2</sup> See Peter, *op. cit.*, II, 206, 278, and the citation above.

<sup>3</sup> *Saturnalia* v. 1. 1-20. Aulus Gellius also gives a list of subjects for discussion at the Saturnalia which suggests many unrecorded predecessors of Macrobius' feast of reason; topics of the sort under consideration here are not actually mentioned, but would be appropriate in connection with those given and reflect the *praelectio*.

*Noct. Att.* xviii. 2. 6: "aut sententia poetae veteris lepide obscure, non anxie, aut decreti cuiuspiam ex philosophia perperam invulgati purgatio, aut captionis sophisticae solutio aut inopinati rariorisque verbi indagatio, aut tempus item in verbo perspicuo obscurissimum."

a poet as Virgil indicates that the dispute over Lucan did not per se imply adverse criticism of his poem. Such criticism there undoubtedly was, in abundance, but incidental to this issue or quite apart from it. The real question concerned the accepted canons of literary style: Did the innovations in Lucan's work make it incorrect to classify the author as a poet, or was he really a historian employing a metrical form for his account of the Civil War? If his work did not conform to the rules of epic poetry, did it justify some alteration of the canon? Eumolpus' argument may here be repeated as expressing the usual form of opposition to considering Lucan a poet:

One must take care that the epigrams do not stand out from the body of the speech; they must shine with a brilliancy that is woven into the material . . . anyone who attempts the vast theme of the Civil War will shrink under the burden unless he is full of literature. It is not a question of recording real events in verse; historians can do that far better. The free spirit of genius must plunge headlong into allusions and divine interpretations, and rack itself for epigrams colored by mythology, so that what results seems rather the prophecies of an inspired seer than the exactitude of a statement made on oath before witnesses. . . .<sup>1</sup>

As the poem by which Eumolpus illustrated his criticism shows, the fundamental basis of the question was whether an epic could eliminate divine intervention and mythological color. Theophrastus' definition of epic, which had become canonical among the Roman critics, required the fusion of the affairs of gods, heroes, and men.<sup>2</sup> It is customary now, and probably was in the first and second centuries, to assume that the omission of *deorum ministeria* and the effort to supply their place by effective use of various manifestations of the supernatural were Lucan's innovation. The *Aeneid* had so far fixed the pattern of epic poetry in men's minds that they forgot that there had been epic poets before Virgil. If he had carried out his plan of writing of Augustus' battles instead of mirroring the Augustan Age in the toils that founded the Roman people, he would have had to face the same dilemma that confronted Lucan. If he had then made Lucan's choice, it might have met with less criticism, since the *Aeneid*

<sup>1</sup> Petronius *Satyricon* 118, quoted by permission from the translation by Heseltine, Loeb Classical Library, 1913.

<sup>2</sup> See the discussion of the varieties of poetry, formerly attributed to Suetonius, and published in Reifferscheid's edition of Suetonius (Leipzig, 1860), p. 17. See also the initial statement of Servius on *carmen heroicum*.

would not have existed as the norm for Roman epic, with its divine interventions conditioned largely by the setting in the heroic age of the ancestors of the Julian gens. One cannot help feeling, however, that whatever his subject, Virgil would have avoided the fault that is particularly noticeable in the *Pharsalia* when judged by Aristotle's standards for epic poetry. The lack of unity in plan and theme, and the lack of a clearly marked hero, have often been criticized as the great failures of Lucan's work. While Eumolpus does not bring out this point in his discussion of epic poetry, it may very well have entered into the controversy, since the contrast with the *Aeneid* is no less striking in this matter than in the *deorum ministeria*.<sup>1</sup> Obviously the modern criticism that such recent events as the second Civil War did not form a suitable theme for epic treatment cannot be seriously considered, though it has been much stressed by editors, and notably, as I have shown, by Burmann. It is a natural basis for our estimates of the *Pharsalia*, but not for gauging ancient criticism, except as the recent date of the events narrated conditioned the decision to exclude direct divine participation in the action. And other poets had chosen the same theme.<sup>2</sup> Neither may we assume any real religious bias in the criticism. When an Epicurean like Eumolpus censures a writer strongly tinged with Stoicism for failing to credit the gods with their due part in human affairs, he is obviously swayed by critical rather than pious motives!

The use of epic poetry as a vehicle for modern history had magnificent precedents in Rome, for the earliest Roman histories in Latin had been written in verse as a matter of course. Naevius and Ennius, entirely unconcerned with future distinctions between history and poetry, appear to have used divine intervention in the earlier and more legendary parts of their work, that period of Roman development which Livy judged too mythical to afford a sound basis for the historian's art. As they approached their own times they adopted a

<sup>1</sup> See Aristotle *Poetics* 23; Ziehen *op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>2</sup> Aristotle makes it clear that it is not the period or historical truth of a subject that determines whether it is to be treated as history or epic, any more than the mere question whether it be written in prose or verse: "And if he should come to take a subject from actual history, he is none the less a poet for that; since some historical occurrences may very well be in the probable and possible order of things; and it is in that aspect of them that he is their poet" (*op. cit.* ix. 1451b [trans. Bywater; Oxford, 1909]).

more pragmatic method, and ceased to mingle the deeds of gods and men. Hostius, the continuator of Ennius, however, had the gods play a mighty part in the Istrian War, and his example was thereafter generally followed. One might reasonably say that Lucan's innovation was actually a return to the principles of Ennius.<sup>1</sup> The setting chosen by Virgil for his national epic required *deorum ministeria* as naturally as did the earlier books of Ennius; it is true that the description of Actium in *Aeneid* viii has the human battle paralleled and influenced by a divine conflict in true Homeric style, but this does not necessarily mean that Virgil would have used the same technique in an epic depicting Actium as a contemporary event. He had devised a magnificent means of glorifying the present by an epic set in the legendary past, in which divine intervention was an essential element. It seems tenable that the greatness of his work led critics to overlook the distinction made by Ennius between the methods of treating legendary and historical periods, if indeed they did not ignore Ennius' example entirely as belonging to the formative period of Latin literature instead of its full development. At any rate, the *Aeneid* helped to make the gods indispensable to epic poetry.

The list of Roman epics on national events and especially on the civil wars proves amply that such themes were not considered incapable of epic treatment; their very number, apparently in general making free use of divine interventions, accounts adequately for the loss of the earlier distinction. The suggestion recently made by Professor Mendell that Asinius Pollio's *nova carmina* actually consisted of an epic on the Civil War, with Cato as its hero, which was written in a new rhetorical style, and served as the model for Lucan's epic, is particularly interesting in this connection. According to this theory, Pollio would furnish a more recent, if little-remembered, precedent for Lucan's innovation.<sup>2</sup> The *deus ex machina* had long been recognized as the easiest way of escape for the poet as well as for his characters, and it was natural that the lesser men should not seek to avoid it. The critics of Lucan could very naturally retort, if the example of

<sup>1</sup> See Collignon, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-14; W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der röm. Literatur* (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 63.

<sup>2</sup> C. W. Mendell, "The Epic of Asinius Pollio," *Yale Classical Studies*, I (1928), 204-7. See the list of epics given by Ribbeck, *op. cit.*, II, 341-44, and the comments on this point made by Norden, "Vergils Aeneis im Lichte ihrer Zeit," *Neue Jahrbücher*, VII (1901), 318-19.



Ennius were brought out, that he, too, in his later *Annals* was historian rather than poet.

Ribbeck suggests that the general reading public was tired of mythological epic and so found the "new" style much to its taste.<sup>1</sup> If his surmise is correct, it may account for some part of the objections of orthodox writers to Lucan's method.

A point of difference between the *Pharsalia* and other epics that has scarcely been mentioned in this connection is the very slight rôle played in it by women, though the theme offered excellent opportunities in this regard.<sup>2</sup> This lack might have affected the general popularity of the work among a public that would vainly seek another Dido in each new epic. In the *Pharsalia* they would find not even the elusive shade of Creusa. We have no evidence whether the lack was actually felt or not. But one is tempted to comment that if Lucan was a historian, it was after the Thucydidean rather than the Herodotean model, since gods and women, except for two or three lay-figures, are excluded from his plan.

His successors seem to have decided unanimously in favor of the gods. The case of Statius cannot, however, be cited as indicating his stand in the controversy, for Lucan himself would scarcely have been able to avoid having the gods share in the exploits of the *Achilleis* and *Thebais*, unless he wished to write satire rather than epic. The case of the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus is similar, and his poem gives abundant evidence of much study of Lucan's work. Silius Italicus chose a theme more akin to that of the *Pharsalia*. But the Punic wars must have seemed almost as remote as the conflicts of Aeneas to the Romans living after the end of the republic. In any case, Silius was hardly the man to choose a more difficult course when he had before him the recipe for high-sounding, albeit hackneyed epic. During the early empire, also, it may have seemed to Lucan's rivals more prudent to gain divine sanction for a republican epic by stressing divine intervention in the events recorded. The *princeps* in his hope of future divinity would then be more likely to overlook any indiscreet enthusiasm for a Cato or a Brutus.<sup>3</sup>

Since the classification of the *Pharsalia* depended so much on the

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, III, 122-23.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> See Giraud, "Un poète républicain sous Néron," *Revue des deux mondes*, X (1875), 423-44, for a study of the political aspects of Lucan's work.

current criteria for the different branches of literature, it is necessary to consider these in some detail, as far as they have any bearing on the question. As we have seen, there was room for much difference of opinion as to the basic definitions and the latitude permissible in their application. Eumolpus represents the conservatives, while those who maintained that Lucan's work entitled him to be classified as a poet took a more liberal view.

As instances already noted indicate, the question involved not only the distinction between history and poetry, but between history and rhetoric also. The development of something like a definite *lex historiae* in the late republic and early empire also needs consideration.

History, poetry, and oratory formed so usual a trinity in the schools that the overlapping of the three styles and consequent need for critical distinctions between them were completely natural. Varro described the first study of children as the knowledge gained from poets, historians, and orators.<sup>1</sup> Cicero summed up Curio's ignorance by saying that he had neither read any poetry, heard any orator, nor acquired any historical knowledge.<sup>2</sup> Quintilian prescribed for the orator knowledge of the ancient *exempla* stored up by historians, and of the inventions of the more famous poets.<sup>3</sup> He pointed out, however, the common error of over-close imitation of poets and historians in oratory, and of orators in poetry and history. *Sua cuique proposita lex, suus cuique decor est.*<sup>4</sup> The three branches are combined in the school curriculum but must be clearly distinguished in actual literary composition—an ideal not always to be attained.

The aims and functions of history, the style and content required of historical work, and the definition of the *lex historiae* all received much attention in learned discussions in the last century of the republic and later. Cicero and his friends questioned whether there had been any real historiography among the Romans—"as our men write, there is no occasion for oratory; bare accuracy is sufficient."<sup>5</sup> But even the Greeks did not rise above the mere chronicling of events in their earlier attempts at history, and Roman history has gradually risen from the compilation of annals for the public memory to a more liter-

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Peter, *op. cit.*, I, 1, from Wilmanns, *Varr. Gramm. lib. reliq.*, p. 208.

<sup>2</sup> *Brutus* lix. 214; cf. *De oratore* i. 42. 187.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* x. 2. 22.

<sup>3</sup> *Inst. or.* xii. 1. 13.

<sup>5</sup> *De oratore* ii. 12. 51.

ary stage, though still insufficiently developed. Style is as yet lamentably lacking, but the chief law of history has been clearly established, never to dare say anything false, or to withhold any true statement, but to write without fear or favor. These foundations of the art are recognized by all. The historian's style must be clear and flowing, though concise, and without the asperity of judicial pronouncements or the sting of forensic pleading.<sup>1</sup> Thus a good rhetorical training is essential to the historian, but he must be careful not to confuse the style requirements of historical composition with those of other rhetorical work. On the other hand, it is only by an adequate knowledge of historical events that the orator can become anything but a child, and he will find the materials of history a source both of charm and of weight in his discourse.<sup>2</sup> The generous emphasis on the ethical value of history,<sup>3</sup> and on its use as a source of *exempla* for the orator, led naturally to much neglect of the essential law of history, and failure to develop valid methods of critical research had an equally disastrous effect. Bede saw the *vera lex historiae* in a very different light, and many of his predecessors would have welcomed his definition as more suited to their product than Cicero's "because, and this is the true law of history, we have simply sought to record for the benefit of posterity such facts as common report has enabled us to collect."<sup>4</sup>

The self-styled historian who wished to neglect Cicero's primary rule might, as today, cloak his mendacity with the useful phrase *penes auctores fides erit*,<sup>5</sup> but accuracy remained the first principle in theory, however dishonored in practice. We are reminded of Eumolpus' suggestion that the lack of mythological fiction was enough to put a work into the historical rather than the epic class when we read Pliny's defense of the authority he has for a fabulous-sounding tale. "The author is not trustworthy, yet what has a poet to do with credibility? Still he is an author in whom you might well have confidence even if he were to write a history."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 51-54; xv. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Orator* xxxv. 120.

<sup>3</sup> See the famous definition in *De oratore* ii. 9. 36: "Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vetustatis, qua voce alia nisi oratoris immortalitati commendatur?"

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. eccl.*, Dedication; Plummer, *Ven. Baedae opera* (Oxford, 1896).

<sup>5</sup> Seneca *Nat. quaest.* iv. 3. 1: Peter, *op. cit.*, I, 80.

<sup>6</sup> *Ep.* ix. 33. 1.

How this requirement was cast aside by the majority of the throng who profited by the great popularity of historical themes in the middle of the second century is strikingly illustrated by Lucian's *Way to Write History*, with its picture of the shocking violations of all the rules of the art. Particularly germane to the present discussion is his reiteration that the useful, and the truth which is its only source, are the sole concern and aim of history. Notable too is his diatribe against the current idea of history-writing as a universal gift, requiring no art; and his scorn of those whose mental weakness is such that they are actually unable to distinguish between history and poetry in determining the ornaments appropriate to their work. Lucian and Eumolpus would agree on this point at least.

Quintilian's discussions of the proper historical style agree well with Cicero's, as one would expect.<sup>1</sup> Pliny the Younger showed how well established the false conception already was in his time, which Lucian was later to attack, when he said that whereas oratory and poetry had little favor unless composed with the greatest eloquence, history gave delight however it was written—*historia quoquo modo scripta delectat*—owing to men's natural curiosity and thirst for knowledge, or what might pass as such.<sup>2</sup> It may, therefore, be as well for Pliny's reputation that he felt it impossible to write a history without interfering with his legal practice, which he could not bring himself to give up.

Had Cicero been free to write the history which his friends demanded of him, we should have a better opportunity to judge how well Lucan, according to the current Roman conceptions, met the requirements of historical truth and well-controlled historical style in the composition of his epic.<sup>3</sup> The context would seem to indicate their desire for a prose history on a wider field than that covered in his historical poems *De consulatu suo* and *De temporibus suis*. The fragments of these indicate at least his conception of hexameter verse as an appropriate vehicle for contemporary history, but leave us in the dark as to his abilities in objective historical composition. Atticus' confidence in Cicero's ability to produce the model history was re-

<sup>1</sup> *Inst. or.* ix. 4. 17-18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* v. 8.

<sup>3</sup> *De legibus* 1. 2. 5-6. Cf. *De oratore* ii. 9. 36 and the fragment from Cornelius Nepos in praise of Cicero (Peter, *Hist. Rom. Reliquiae* [Leipzig, 1906], II, 40, 17: "ille enim fuit unus, qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare. . . . dubito, interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat."

inforced by Cicero's own belief that history was closer to oratory than to any other branch of literature.<sup>1</sup>

Herein lay Lucan's best claim, perhaps, aside from the negative one of his failure to qualify for the mythological requirement of epic poetry—to be considered as a historian. Yet the strong rhetorical element in his epic could not, as now, have affected men's estimate of his poetic genius, especially since Eumolpus' model epic is fully as rhetorical as the *Pharsalia*. And the famous verdict that Lucan should be imitated rather by orators than poets<sup>2</sup> may perhaps be taken as an indication that Quintilian, too, would have preferred to class Lucan as a historian. The phrase *ut dicam quod sentio* seems to show that his statement deals with a controversial point, and he has so strongly stressed the importance of historical study for the orator that it is unnecessary to assume with Peterson that Quintilian is here "combating the prevailing sentiment about Lucan," presumably with a third classification as a rhetorician. I note in this connection that the adjective *concitatus* here used of Lucan describes one of the qualities to be sought by the orator in that reading of history which is to prevent him from growing stale in the exclusive study of rhetorical treatises.<sup>3</sup> Like Cicero, Quintilian emphasized the relationship of history and oratory in spite of his insistence on a clear distinction between them in the actual writing.<sup>4</sup> History thus became increasingly subordinated to rhetoric in the schools, and the modification of rhetorical elements to form a suitable historical style was sure to be more and more neglected.<sup>5</sup> To insist, therefore, that Lucan must be considered only as rhetorician seems to involve the modern rather than the ancient definitions.<sup>6</sup>

Quintilian viewed the elements in historical style which the orator must avoid imitating as being due to its close relationship to poetry as

<sup>1</sup> *Orator* xx. 66: "huic generi historia finitima est, in qua et narratur ornate et regio saepe aut pugna describitur; interponuntur etiam contiones et hortationes, sed in his tracta quaedam et fluens expetitur, non haec contorta et acris oratio."

<sup>2</sup> *Inst. or.* x. 1. 190: "Lucanus ardens et concitatus, et sententiis clarissimus, et, ut dicam quod sentio, magis oratoribus quam poetis imitandus."

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* iii. 8. 67-68; W. Peterson, *Quintiliani institutionis oratoriae liber decimus* (Oxford, 1891), p. 87 n. See also *Inst. or.* x. 1. 31.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 18.5; see also Pliny *Ep.* v. 8.

<sup>5</sup> See Peter, *Gesch. Lit.*, I, 10 ff., 63-64; II, 193-94 and elsewhere.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 74, and numerous recent commentators on Lucan.

well as to oratory. History was a sort of prose poem.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps he would not draw the line between history and poetry as sharply as Lucian did. In spite of Aristotle's statement of the impossibility of a fusion of the two genres, since history deals with singulars and poetry with universals,<sup>2</sup> there was a general tendency among Greek critics, as we have seen, to confuse history with poetry. The habit of using the earlier poets as *auctores* for historical events increased the tendency to this confusion among both Greeks and Romans. Cicero, however, like Quintilian, pointed out the danger of confusing the laws of the two styles.<sup>3</sup> Other critics, as we have already seen, emphasized the old distinction on which Eumolpus' definition was based—that in contrast with history, which dealt only with men, epic poetry required the combination of men, heroes, and gods. Servius, by his preoccupation with the historical elements in the *Aeneid*, hoped to classify the common characteristics of history and poetry and the distinctions between them.<sup>4</sup> Clearly, then, there was ample ground in Roman literary criticism for the debate about Lucan. And the grounds on which some critics questioned his use of a true poetic method do not imply doubt as to his genius, which would remain a matter of personal opinion. The question whether, on the basis of present-day historical criticism, Lucan is entitled to rank as a historian does not lie within the scope of this study, and the opinions of modern scholars have varied as much as those of ancient critics who asked the same question in a different spirit.<sup>5</sup> It can hardly be questioned, however, that Lucan's own purpose was to compose an epic of the civil wars, using the technique that seemed to him best suited to the subject, and for which

<sup>1</sup> *Inst. or.* x. 1. 31: "Est enim proxima poetis et quodammodo carmen solutum, et scribitur ad narrandum non ad probandum . . . et verbis remotioribus et liberioribus figuris narrandi taedium evitat."

Cf. the opinions of the Greek critics on the close relationship of the two. Dionysius' descriptions of the works of Herodotus and Thucydides as beautiful poems is a case in point, as also the dispute whether history belonged to the department of rhetoric or of poetry, not seldom decided in favor of the latter, with much resulting confusion of method. On this see Rohde, *Der Griechische Roman* (3d ed.; Leipzig, 1914), p. 336, n. 1; Peter, *op. cit.*, II, 203 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* 9. 1451b; cf. Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

<sup>3</sup> *De legibus* i. 2. 5.

<sup>4</sup> See the list of pertinent passages given by Ziehen, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

<sup>5</sup> In support of the actual historical value of Lucan's work may be noted Ziehen's article cited above (reviewed by Jeep in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* [1895], pp. 113-14) and Jullian, "Lucain Historien," *Revue des études anciennes*, I (1899), 329-40.



there was sufficient precedent in the period before the full development of the canons of Roman literary criticism and perhaps more recently also.

As we have seen, the *Pharsalia* continued in later times to be widely read and plagiarized by historians and poets alike, with due esteem for its rhetorical qualities. Fronto was the rare exception in protesting against the latter, and the lines to which he objected were among those frequently quoted later, but also frequently accredited to Seneca instead of Lucan.<sup>1</sup>

The chief historians of the period during which Lucan's work was being most discussed clearly classed him as one of the poets who would particularly benefit the orator by lending a poetic beauty to his style. Tacitus' choice of Horace, Virgil, and Lucan as the three models to be chiefly studied is a sufficient indication of his judgment in the case,<sup>2</sup> and of the acceptance of Lucan by some rhetoricians as a poet meet for their study. It is obvious that the natural classification of the *Pharsalia* was that of Martial's bookseller. To cite the opposing side as representing the mass of contemporary opinion is to overlook the obvious fact that the critics who refused to accept it as a poem had the burden of proof on their side and must do the loudest shouting.

Petronius' judgment of Lucan, as distinguished from that which he assigns to Eumolpus, has been abundantly discussed, and with so little general agreement that it is not feasible to attempt at this point even to summarize the many theories. I have already indicated my own feeling that Petronius used this particular subject as a point of departure for Eumolpus' rantings because it was a popular controversy and generally current, providing the best opportunity for a literary disquisition. The inherent parody, it seems to me, is of Eumolpus and his ilk, rather than of Lucan. What Petronius' final decision on the question was cannot be absolutely determined; he

<sup>1</sup> *Frontonis epistulae*, ed. S. Naber (Leipzig, 1867), p. 157: "is initio carminis sui septem primis versibus nihil aliud quam *bella plus quam civilia* interpretatus est . . . at enim sunt quaedam in libris eius scite dicta."

<sup>2</sup> *Dialogus* 20: "exigitur namque ab oratore etiam poeticus decor . . . ex Horatii et Virgilii et Lucani sacrario prolatus. Horum igitur auribus et iudiciis obtemperans nostrorum oratorum aetas pulchrior et ornatior extitit."

Those who do not accept the Tacitean authorship of the *Dialogus* will need to see in this passage not the historian's judgment but only the practice in one at least of the leading rhetorical groups, of regarding Lucan as a poet.

might plausibly be counted with those who did not think it open to debate. The use of the customary epic machinery in his poem on the Civil War does not invariably convince the reader that he thought it an improvement on Lucan's method, and the imitation of Lucan's phrases and figures that is an essential and constant part of the poem precludes the possibility that he considered Lucan's work lacking in poetic merit.<sup>1</sup>

Silius Italicus, who discarded Lucan's method in favor of the active intervention of the gods, found himself mocked and forgotten for his pains; if Lucan's procedure aroused controversy, still success could not be won merely by abjuring it. Martial and Statius, who laughed at Silius' efforts, could not find enough words of praise for Lucan. Both felt his influence in their style. It is not necessary to assume that the patronage of Martial by Lucan's family was the sole cause of the praises he gave Lucan. However that may be, Martial's public verdict was that Lucan was an epic poet indeed, and a great one. His mention of the question in the distich already cited more than once lends added point to his emphasis on Apollo and the Castalian waters and his description of Lucan as the "glory of our Helicon" chanting savage wars to a Pierian accompaniment.<sup>2</sup> The impression is distinctly epic. Of Martial's admiration for Lucan as a best-seller I have already spoken.

Juvenal also commented on Lucan's prosperous fame, and studied the *Pharsalia* with care, showing its influence in diverse ways.<sup>3</sup> The hundred and thirty-five verses of Statius' *Genethliacon* are full of Lucan's praises. The muse of Ennius, Lucretius, Valerius Flaccus, and

<sup>1</sup> On this point I agree fully with Collignon, *op. cit.* I am not convinced, however, that Petronius meant to sponsor Eumolpus' criticism of Lucan's neglect of epic machinery, and, as I have shown, I do not believe that the choice of subject was motivated simply by Petronius' possession of a "school poem" of the sort. This is just the sort of poem that he might have written purposely for Eumolpus to quote, with some malicious intention in drawing from Lucan so many of his best phrases and making the barren critic's model essentially a cento of Virgil and Lucan. If he did re-work a school piece, we need not assume therefore that he had not preserved other old exercises which might equally well have been used had their subject been as appropriate to his purpose.

<sup>2</sup> *Epigramm.* vii. 22, 23; x. 64.

<sup>3</sup> *Sat.* vii. 79-80:

"contentus fama iaceat Lucanus in hortis  
marmoreis."

On Juvenal's general use of Lucan see Weymann, "Zu lateinischen Dichtern. II," *Neophilologus*, VII (1921), 283.

Ovid shall yield to him; even the *Aeneid* shall honor his song.<sup>1</sup> This praise is admittedly extravagant, though justified for succeeding centuries by the estimation of the *Pharsalia* as second only to the *Aeneid* among Latin epics. Statius mentioned none but writers of epic and only the chief of these; thus there can be no doubt of the verdict he would give. That he chose heroic subjects for his own epic poems is sufficient to account for his use of *deorum ministeria*, and, as I have suggested, we must not assume that this choice implied a criticism of Lucan's method. It may well be that he felt himself unfitted to cope with the problem of a pragmatic treatment of a recent historical theme.

I have endeavored to trace the history of the controversy whether Lucan was a poet or a historian for its bearing on Roman literary criticism both within and outside the schools, and on the continuance of such questions from the classical into the mediaeval period, and to indicate in this connection some estimates of Lucan's work in his own time and later. Considering the room for disagreement in the literary questions involved, history as well as poetry might claim him, but the critics could not disprove his rights as a poet. The leading writers of his age, on the basis of their own conception of poetic genius, ranked him as an epic poet worthy of high praise, and men have not since been lacking to concur in their judgment.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> *Silvae* ii. 7. 75-80.

## HORACE AND OCTAVIAN (*Car.* I. 2)

BY JEFFERSON ELMORE

IN THE rejoicing over Octavian's anticipated return from the East in 29 and the celebration of his triple ovation<sup>1</sup> Horace was silent. With a single exception, nothing that he wrote belongs to this period or was inspired by the occasion. Such is the assumption of the editors and biographers, but it is an assumption which, in the light of the circumstances, it does not seem easy to justify. Let us first consider the situation at Rome. Though the time of Octavian's return was uncertain, from the moment the news was received of the fall of Alexandria preparations had been going on for his reception. There were to be two triumphal arches, one in the city and the other at Brundisium. The temple of Janus was closed and extraordinary honors were bestowed on Caesar by the Senate. It was even proposed that the whole population go to meet him on his arrival, which was to be followed by the three great triumphs and many days of celebration.<sup>2</sup> In such a situation, which both marked the final victory of Octavian and symbolized for the people the prospect of relief from their sufferings, it would be strange, indeed, if Horace had uttered no word.

Not only Horace but Vergil also, both enlisted in the imperial cause, would feel the spell of the occasion. The latter, in fact, was not slow to realize its importance and was already busy putting finishing touches to his *Georgics*, which he planned to present to Octavian on his arrival as a personal offering.<sup>3</sup> It may be said Horace had already done his part in the composition of i. 37—his exultation over the death of Cleopatra. But in this, though voicing the universal joy at the

<sup>1</sup> After the capture of Alexandria (Aug. 1, 30) Octavian spent two or three months in Egypt and then led his army through the Sinaitic peninsula to Syria. After spending some weeks at Antioch (occupied with the Parthian problem among others), he turned westward to the province of Asia and Samos, whence he made his way to Italy. Celebration of the triumphs began Aug. 13, 29.

<sup>2</sup> Dio li. 19-23.

<sup>3</sup> Donat. *Vit. Verg.* (ed. Reiff.) 61. At Otella, where he rested before proceeding to Rome, Octavian listened on four successive days to the reading of the Vergilian opus.

ending of the Egyptian menace—*fatale monstrum*—he had paid no special honor to Octavian, and had closed with praise for the spirit and courage of the woman whom Octavian wished, if not to slay, at least to lead in triumph. At best, the ode is a recognition of an individual achievement, but of Caesar's great rôle as leader and savior of the state it has nothing to say. Something different was called for, and it is my contention that Horace responded to the demands of the situation with the ode we have now for consideration.

Is there evidence that this particular ode falls within the required period?<sup>1</sup> I think there is. It is generally conceded by those differing in opinion as to the correct date that it was written after the close of the civil war. This seems presupposed by the poem as a whole, and especially by verses 20–25, which clearly look back on a disaster which has run its course and which on a different supposition would hardly be intelligible. The end of civil strife is fixed by Macrobius as the fall of Alexandria,<sup>2</sup> so that allowing time for the news to reach Rome, we have the beginning of September in the year 30 as the *terminus post quem*. A *terminus ante quem* can be seen in verses 51–52 in the reference to the Medes. As Dessau has shown,<sup>3</sup> it was expected at Rome that Octavian, while in the East with his powerful army, would settle accounts with the Parthians, securing the frontier and gaining treasure from the country. It is to this expectation that Horace gives fleeting voice. His words, brief as they are, imply that Octavian was in personal contact with the Parthian situation—as yet unresolved—which had not been the case before and was not to be so again until seven years later. The reference, then, must be to Octavian's stay in Syria before his departure for the province of Asia and Samos. Otherwise, particularly after the arrangement with Phraates, it would have no point except as a conventional recognition of imperial policy quite uncharacteristic of the pragmatic Horace. The inference, then, is that

<sup>1</sup> The ode has been variously dated by editors. It is assigned, e.g., by Nauck-Hoppe to a time preceding Actium; by Franke (*Fasti Horat.*, p. 144), to the latter part of 29 after Octavian's return; by Kiessling-Heinze, to the winter of 28–27 (before the adoption of the new constitution, and by T. Frank (*Catullus and Horace*, p. 286, n. 22), to 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Sat.* i. 12, 35: Cum . . . et Aegyptus hoc mense in potestatem populi Romani redacta sit, finisque hoc mense bellis civilibus impositus sit.

<sup>3</sup> *Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, I, 10.

the composition of the ode falls in the last three months of the year 30. It is subsequent, of course, to i. 37, and doubtless came to Octavian's notice in no long time after its composition.

In its subject matter, moreover, the ode is appropriate to the occasion and, incidentally, creditable to Horace's own insight. Recovered from his exultation over Cleopatra, he could see that neither the victory at Actium nor the taking of Alexandria could wipe out the effects of civil strife, continued now for twenty-five years almost without interruption. And so in the first part of the poem he seeks to convey a sense of these deep injuries and dangers. He does this not in despair, as formerly,<sup>1</sup> but rather with confidence in the outcome, which pictured under the figure of the gods coming to earth, he saw realized in the régime of victorious Caesar. In short, while a declaration of devotion and loyalty, it is tempered by a profound recognition of the public woes.

Horace's general attitude is thus sufficiently clear. It remains to consider more precisely the impression he wishes to convey of Octavian. Here we are confronted with the commentators—the embattled commentators, one might almost say—who insist that Horace intends to represent Octavian as a god and more particularly as the god Mercury, who is supposed to be incarnate in him. To one regarding the ode in its historical setting and ignorant of Horatian commentary this view would come as a shock. No one at Rome, neither Vergil (who did not lack the will)<sup>2</sup> nor a subservient Senate, had spoken of Octavian as a god, and that the critical and not over enthusiastic Horace should do so, comes as lightning out of a clear sky. It may be said in extenuation that modern commentators have the authority of Porphyrio, whose statement that Horace flattered Augustus by saying he was the god Mercury they have reiterated with quite singular unanimity.<sup>3</sup> But however capable of explanation, the supposition that Horace represents Octavian as a god and identifies him with Mercury, lacks foundation.

<sup>1</sup> *Epod.* 16.

<sup>2</sup> *Georg.* i. 24–42 seems to belong to a later date. See G. Hirst, "Prologue to the *Georgics*," *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, LIX (1928), 19–32.

<sup>3</sup> American editors are strongly committed to the idea of an incarnate god (see, e.g., the editions of Smith, Moore, and Bennett).



It is a presumption against this view that such an assimilation of Augustus to Mercury is not authenticated elsewhere. There have been several supposed instances, the most familiar and influential being that based on certain inscriptions at Pompeii, to which Mommsen lent the weight of his great authority,<sup>1</sup> but on critical examination these cases have proved untenable.<sup>2</sup> An example in Horace would be unique, signifying not only that he himself had devised it, but that he had devised a form of divinity unknown in the West.<sup>3</sup> Under the circumstances the probability of this may be regarded as negligible.

This becomes still more evident if Octavian's own attitude toward the ascription of divinity to him be taken into account—an attitude he made clear in the East after the battle of Actium. He did not wish to be considered a god.<sup>4</sup> He was not so regarded during his lifetime (except in the East),<sup>5</sup> and when the Senate was contriving honors for him on his return, it refrained from this unmeaning and unwelcome flattery. One can imagine, then, how pleased Octavian would have been to learn that Horace had not only made him a god, but had transformed him into an incarnate Mercury.

That Horace intended nothing of the kind is indicated in the ode itself. Thus in the use of *imitaris*, verse 42 (to impersonate, assume the character of, as in Sat. ii. 3. 186), he revealed what he conceived to be the relation between Mercury and his human counterpart. This seems definitely to exclude the idea of incarnation. Besides Mercury, several divinities are invoked, for each of whom must be assumed the possibility of becoming Octavian. This would have been awkward

<sup>1</sup> CIL (1883), pp. 109, 884. Cf. Nissen, *Pomp. Stud.* (1877), p. 274; Buecheler, *Coniectanea* (1878), p. 19; Kiessling, *Phil. Unters.*, II (1882), 92, n. 37. This supposed identification was overthrown by E. Borman, "Aus Pompeji," *Wiener Eranos* (1909), pp. 314–36.

<sup>2</sup> K. Scott, "Mercur-Augustus und Horaz CI2," *Hermes*, LXIII (1927), 15–33. The author thinks we have an authentic case of identification in an inscription from Cos, in which Augustus is called Hermes. I cannot quite believe this to be true. Augustus is characterized as *divi filius* (*υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*) as well as Hermes. The son of Julius Caesar and Hermes do not seem to represent a real fusion, the latter being, as I think, a title to indicate a sphere of activity. Professor Scott, in line with the tradition of Porphyrio, is a strong believer in Horace's identification.

<sup>3</sup> Attention is called to this by Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 177.

<sup>4</sup> Dio li. 19. 6–9; Suet. *Aug.* 52.

<sup>5</sup> Taylor, "The Worship of Augustus in Italy," *Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc.*, LI (1920), 116 f.; "Tiberius' Refusal of Divine Honors," *ibid.*, LX (1930), 98–99.

in the case of Venus. And very awkward, also, is the fact that Mercury is a symbolic figure. Now symbolism with its implied suggestion may be variously interpreted, but one interpretation is impossible, that of taking the symbolism literally, wherein it is symbolism no longer.

I have said that Mercury is a symbolic figure. In fact, the whole poem is a piece of symbolism, but it is symbolism (and herein lies the key to our difficulties) that is somewhat peculiarly managed in that it is annotated, as it were, with two notes of explanation. In verses 1-20 the symbolism—itself an imaginative rendering of actual events—exemplifies the displeasure of the gods but does not indicate the cause. Not to leave the reader in doubt, in verses 20-24 Horace drops the symbolic manner and tells in plain words that he is referring to the civil wars. Likewise, in verses 29-50 he symbolizes the rescue of the state from its ills as a personal intervention of the gods, which someone of them descending to earth shall undertake. The destined savior is Mercury, who is entreated in a final prayer to remain long among men. Here the poem might end, but again dropping symbolism Horace turns abruptly to Octavian with an appeal not to permit the ravages of the Medes. The purpose of the sudden shift, as in verses 20-24, is to indicate the bearing of what precedes. It is as if Horace said, "I have been talking of the gods in relation to our public misfortunes, but Caesar has been in the background as our actual leader, on whom I wished to throw a light reflected from the divinities themselves."

In carrying out the scheme of divine intervention, it is to be noticed that Horace employs the idea of the *deus praesens*—the god who comes to earth, preserves his own personality, though perhaps in human form, and returns again to heaven, just as Mercury is to come and return. This was an old and familiar idea. Cicero, who refers to it more than once,<sup>1</sup> makes effective use of it in describing the rescue of the city from the intrigues of Catiline.<sup>2</sup>

There is a third significant feature of the symbolism here, I mean the figure of Mercury. It puzzled me exceedingly that there was no indication of his conventional character. The truth is that Mercury is Octavian himself writ large. In human shape he resembles him; he

<sup>1</sup> *Verr.* iv. 107; *ND* ii. 4. 6; iii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Cat.* ii. 19. 29; iii. 18.

is the avenger of (the great) Caesar; he wages wars and celebrates triumphs; he is honored by the Senate; last (most *bouleversant* of all), like Octavian he is a puritan—*vitiis iniquus*. It is not difficult to see why Horace has given Mercury this cast. He is anxious, perhaps over anxious, that his symbolism should be understood, and so he insinuates these pointed indications of its bearing. This does not mean that Mercury and Octavian are one, which (as I have already remarked) would be to violate the very first requirement of symbolism, that it be not taken literally. What it does mean is a suggested association between Mercury and Caesar. Horace does not intend anything so crass as to identify Octavian with Mercury, but he does wish to associate him with the god with subtle suggestion of the greatness of his task and of his power to achieve it. Thus at the end Caesar appears for his brief moment with the light, as it were, thrown upon him by Mercury, and also by the other divinities of the ode.

Association of Augustus with gods and heroes is used later by Horace<sup>1</sup> as well as by Vergil,<sup>2</sup> Ovid,<sup>3</sup> and Livy.<sup>4</sup> It became in fact a recognized literary method. It has a striking parallel in the action of the Senate in the early part of 29 when it decreed that, whenever songs were sung in honor of the gods, Octavian's name should be inserted among them, bestowing on him the honor and prestige of the illustrious company.<sup>5</sup> This is of a piece with Horace's own symbolism, which gave him an opportunity of suggesting a great deal without actually saying too much.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> Associated with Jupiter (i. 12. 51-52); with Pollux and Hercules (iii. 3. 9-12); with Hercules (iii. 14. 1-5); with Bacchus (iii. 25); with Romulus (iv. 5. 1-2).

<sup>2</sup> *Aen.* vi. 781-84.

<sup>3</sup> *Met.* xv. 856 f.

<sup>4</sup> Hirst, "Significance of Augustior," *Amer. Jour. Phil.*, XLVII (1926), 345-57.

<sup>5</sup> *Mon. Anc.* ii. 21; Dio li. 20. 1. This is neither deification (see A. Stein, *Untersuchungen*, p. 18) nor worship of the genius.

## THE CHARACTER TREATMENT OF INORGANIC RÔLES IN ROMAN COMEDY

By ORTHA L. WILNER

A CAREFUL characterization of the major rôles in drama is demanded by any standards of artistry; the comparative attention paid to minor rôles reflects the interest of the author in characterization for its own sake.<sup>1</sup> Of the minor rôles in Roman comedy, those with the least claim to attention on the part of the poet are what may be called "inorganic," a term explained by Prescott<sup>2</sup> in a study of their economic purposes in the plots of Roman comedy:

Dramatic action in Roman comedy is carried on mainly by characters who continue through the play and are closely interwoven in the web of the plot. Apart from these there are a number of other characters who may in different degrees be called inorganic. . . . I am interested in any rôles that seem to be in any degree loosely or mechanically attached to the main action.

It is my purpose to examine the extent and technique of the characterization of such rôles, as an index to the attitude of the writers of Roman comedy toward characterization. Prescott's grouping of them as those occurring in the exposition and initial action, those occurring in the main action, and those occurring in the concluding action will also serve me; and I add another category, of those who do not appear on the stage at all.

Among those occurring in the initial action, the protatic rôles are

<sup>1</sup> Most analyses of character treatment in Greek and Roman comedy deal predominantly with a description of the traits revealed, especially in the major rôles, adverting to the technique used to reveal them either not at all or in fragmentary and incidental fashion. A thorough discussion of major rôles in Terence by Siess, "Ueber die Charakterzeichnung in den Komödien des Terenz," *Wiener Studien*, XXVIII (1906), 229-62; XXIX (1907), 81-109, 289-320, is of this sort, emphasizing however some points in technique, such as the use of contrast, or the reappearance in a son of his father's traits. Legrand, *Daos* (Paris, 1910), gives full composite pictures of the persons of comedy by types, minor as well as major rôles, but has little to say about technique or about the relative completeness of individual portraits. Steinmann, *De artis poeticae veteris parte quae est περὶ ἥρώων* (Göttingen, 1907), tries to prove that Donatus' discussion of character treatment is based on Aristotle; and includes Donatus' comments on devices for character portrayal.

<sup>2</sup> "Inorganic Rôles in Roman Comedy," *Classical Philology*, XV (1920), 245-81.  
[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, XXVI, July, 1931]

most distinctly inorganic. They consist mainly of slaves,<sup>1</sup> beside whom should be set the less frequent freedman, flatterer, and courtesan. As would be expected on a priori grounds, these are often mere pawns, endowed with a few typical traits emphasized in greater or less degree. Thesprio of the *Epidicus* is a good illustration, of the type of the surly slave. He is surly and resentful at Epidicus' first interruption (1-4); surly and uncommunicative under his questioning (17-56); gratuitously disagreeable, resentful, and jealous (25-28, 61-62, 75-76, 66); and uneasily anxious to escape (63-80). He boasts of his success in thievery.<sup>2</sup> A physical characteristic indicative of a mental attitude is his swift stride. As means of presenting these traits, the poet makes him use brief, chopped-off answers, taunts, billingsgate; makes him boast; makes him postpone for a long time the giving of the information which Epidicus is trying to elicit; he has him make several efforts to escape from his questioner, ending in a sigh of relief when he succeeds; he has Epidicus complain of his rapid stride. Contrast of the two slaves is employed throughout. The scene is written in metres intended for singing, a manner of presentation which would of course tend to obscure such details as are given, leaving only the dominant impression of surliness. The purpose of the character, besides explaining the antecedents of the plot, is to help introduce Epidicus and to sketch the character of one of the principals of the play.

In the scale of individualization, Philotis and Syra of the *Hecyra* stand below Thesprio, their traits revealed by the admonitions of the one in the spirit of the superannuated courtesan and the half-hearted opposition of her youthful, weaker, and less rapacious companion. The extremely slight characterization of Sosia in the *Andria*, the type of the good and responsible freedman, is obtained by his patron's compliments (*And.* 33, 38), and Sosia's polite protest (*And.* 40-44), and by his quoting a few *sententiae* (61, 68). Characterization slighter than this is well-nigh impossible except for a mute; the rôle merely furnishes ears for Simo's exposition, and so assists in the characterization of Simo and his son.

<sup>1</sup> Chalandon, *De servis apud Plautum* (Lyons, 1857), who describes the character of slaves (all slaves, not protatic slaves only) from a moral point of view, is biased, emotional, and unreliable in judgment.

<sup>2</sup> This is scarcely more than a typical trait of slaves; cf. Stasimus in *Tri.* 413, Cyamus in *Truc.* 559, Strobilus in *Aul.* 620-22.

Going up the scale we find Davus of the *Phormio*, Palinurus of the *Curculio*, and Grumio of the *Mostellaria*. In the case of Davus the trite, philosophizing entrance monologue assumes importance in character delineation. Side lights on his character are revealed by expressions of admiration for Geta's audacity during his master's absence and bravado in the face of imminent retribution, and by advice and approval of a policy of expediency. By contrast he assists in the revelation of Geta, the permanent slave rôle of the play. Palinurus' concern for his young master's morals, betrayed through admonitions, marks him as a pedagogue type. He reveals also a merry impudence, twisting meanings for the sake of witticisms, ironically making game of his master and others, shrewdly estimating his master's extravagant moods and promises. A boast at the end of Act II, scene i, shows his charlatanry and boastfulness. The presentation of Grumio is both full, so far as space allows, and dramatic.<sup>1</sup> The device used is a lively quarrel-scene with strong contrast throughout. Bitterly resentful complaints of his fellow-slave's smart tricks, a long arraignment of his debauchery and the corrupting of his young master show his own uncompromising honesty; his fervent wish for his old master's return and repeated harping on that theme, his expressed consciousness of being a worthy slave, his homely philosophy of compensations in taking Tranio's blows and contrasting their relative comforts, his soliloquy at the end of the scene when he prays for his master's return and then hastily leaves to avoid the spectacle of his debauched young master—all are means of rounding out his character. One has not the consciousness, as with most protatic rôles, that the need for exposition accounts for every word that is spoken; that need the author might have satisfied and yet left Grumio little more than a pair of ears, like Sosia. Instead, Grumio is characterized in detail, more so even than Tranio, although the latter is the protagonist of the play, directing the entire course of its action, while Grumio never appears after this one introductory scene, and has no function in the plot except to promote conversation during the exposition. The neglect of

<sup>1</sup> This scene is well analyzed by Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1913), I, 110-11. He points out the careful characterization of Grumio, the value of the monologue, the use of contrast, the greater detail in the portrait of the protatic Grumio than in that of the protagonist Tranio. He ascribes this artistic characterization to Philemon, writer of the original of the *Mostellaria*.



the characterization of the permanent rôle, which is more fully developed later, in favor of the temporary one, is eloquent of interest in characterization for its own sake.

In two other protatic rôles, Acanthio in the *Mercator* and Artotrogus in the *Miles gloriosus*, considerable emphasis is laid on character, but in exaggerated form. Acanthio's perverse, impatient temper is revealed first in his solo as a *servus currens*,<sup>1</sup> then in his long refusal, after announcing that he brings bad news, to tell what it is. The poet makes him complain of weariness and hemorrhage, but resent his master's suggestion of a remedy; when Charinus tries to soothe him, promises his freedom, he complains and refuses to believe the promise (probably with good reason); when Charinus begins to work up softly to the message, Acanthio resents his whispering; when Charinus threatens him, he resents the threats; when Charinus begs for the news, he resents the manner of supplication; when Charinus abandons the attempt and asks of other things, he declares he is being prevented from telling his news. This harping on one trait is excellent caricature for the sake of a comic scene. The same may be said of Artotrogus with his extravagant flatteries; and here from the point of view of technique notice should be taken of the inartistic asides in which he explains directly to the audience his motive—parasitic greed—and his true opinion of the soldier.

Such an analysis of protatic rôles leads one to acknowledge that the lines for many were written perfunctorily, as a device to present the exposition, that a few typical traits were ascribed to each of these rôles, almost exclusively such traits as inquisitiveness and love of gossip, which are useful in introducing the exposition; that a few such rôles were presented at some length for the sake of their comic possibilities in caricature; and that a few were developed beyond the barest requirements of exposition and the indispensable minimum of typical traits with side lights on more or less numerous and individual characteristics, once even at the expense of a more permanent rôle. Technical means for presenting these persons include the philosophizing solo; the aside to the audience; admonitions, boasts, flatteries, complaints, taunts, witticisms, proverbs, billingsgate, in dialogue; the ir-

<sup>1</sup> Weissmann, *De servi currentis persona apud comicos Romanos* (Giessen, 1911), discusses stock features of the rôle but has nothing on characterization.

relevant boast of skill; and the ever present contrast. The rôle is useful too in helping to characterize not only the second speaker in the scene, but also those others who are discussed or described in it.

Other characters whose appearances are entirely or almost entirely confined to the initial action show the same treatment. One group reveals a minimum number of traits, such as belong to a given station in life. For instance, the *Lorarius* of the *Captivi* reveals only typical slave traits, with no unusual technical device to express them. Neither are the *lena*e of the *Cistellaria* and *Asinaria* individualized. In the *Cistellaria* a sudden interruption of the conversation with a complaint emphasizes the *lena*'s typical bibulousness. Strikingly noticeable, however, is the long speech in prologue style addressed to the audience which she introduces by an apologetic explanation that she is loquacious when drunk—type traits, but suggested in novel fashion. Later in the play (536–42, 653–55, 660–61) her shrewdness and bibulousness reappear in another's report of her actions. The part of the *lena* in the *Asinaria* consists in large measure of a long quarrel written in metres intended for singing. The lover, with whom she is quarreling, describes her from his point of view in angry song; in reply she describes the habits, methods, and principles of her profession, in part directly, in part through similes, thus characterizing herself. The character-content of the solo offers nothing unusual, but the technique is worth noticing, particularly the general description of a profession and the use of similes. The latter device is used also by the two sisters who are principal characters in the *Poenulus*; it is effective in describing types rather than individualized rôles. Later Cleareta reappears in dialogue, and states the principles of her profession again, in argument with her daughter. The material is all stereotyped.

The *anus lena* of the *Curculio*, on the other hand, is among the caricatures. Her few traits appear in a song given in praise of wine, and in the exaggerated actions indicated by the words—she smells out the trail of the wine, following it on all fours; and shrewdly she waters the hinges to prevent creaking. These are traits typical of her rôle, interesting because of their exaggeration. The use of action is particularly effective.

The third group includes those rôles which are more or less individ-

ualized. Here could be included Pamphila of the *Stichus*, who is a mild foil for her more positive sister; Delphium of the *Mostellaria*, whose merry good nature saves her from being merely another courtesan; and Megaronides of the *Trinummus*, whose second soliloquy (199-222) castigating gossips, himself included, makes him a little more than just another admonisher. The familiar devices of song, topical soliloquy, admonition and advice, with frequent contrast, are employed. Prominent in the group is Scapha of the *Mostellaria*. She appears in a long scene devoted wholly to characterization, as a foil for her young mistress; neither appears thereafter. Again admonitions and rebukes are used, on the inevitable theme of their profession; but Philematium's energetic disapproval raises the scene above the commonplace. Then come more admonitions, on the use and abuse of cosmetics and various articles of apparel. A brief narrative hinting at Scapha's past life assists in the portrait; superstitious admonitions add more. Significant use is made of Scapha's reactions to her mistress' conversation. When her professional advice proves unwelcome and earns threats of punishment, she turns *adsentatrix*, commenting cynically on her own attitude (246): "nunc, ne eius caussa uapulem, tibi potius adsentabor." She praises Philematium unfeignedly also; naïvely she admits a love of praise even if it is not genuine. Further significant technique is the use of an eavesdropper to crystallize the impressions made by the two women. He expresses approval of Scapha's praise of Philematium, disapproval of her professional teachings, and comments on her shrewdness (257, 270 f.):

nunc adsentatrix scelestā est, dudum aduorsatrix erat.  
non uideor uidisse lenam callidiorem ullam alteras.  
ut lepide atque astute in mentem uenit de speculo malae!

And it should be emphasized that this extensive portrait is not a caricature, like that of Leaena in the *Curculio*.

Of these rôles fewer are slaves than among the strictly protatic rôles. In general, more space and attention are given to these; a slightly larger percentage has more or less individual characteristics. Songs become a more prominent means of presentation, both in solo and in duet; soliloquies and admonitions are used freely; philosophizing of various kinds; recital of one's principles; reaction to the situation or to other persons; actions indicated by the text; the comments

of an eavesdropper. In short, these rôles are treated with fuller detail as being more important.

More or less inorganic rôles<sup>1</sup> which occur in the middle of a play or throughout it may be roughly divided into two kinds: those intended chiefly to promote comic incident and those whose main function is to assist in carrying forward the plot. The former in large measure are padding; the latter are secondary or unnecessary but convenient pawns. From the point of view of character this latter group presents striking gradations. The *puer* who carries a package or knocks at a door naturally is not presented in detail. If he is berated as eating to excess but useless to knock at doors (*Bacch.* 577-81), or approved for his zeal in punching a *leno* (*Ad.* 174), or admonished to attend to duty even when sated with food and drink (*Hec.* 769), we feel that the playwright in taking pains to ascribe even these brief hints at stereotyped traits to such incidental persons has displayed a genuine interest in character-drawing. Others with somewhat more extended parts are treated, however, with little more detail. Canthara in the *Adelphoe* (288-98, 335-52) shows optimism and timidity in contrast to her mistress; the *ancilla* of the *Menaechmi* (524-58) is a grasping, clever, and suspicious replica of her mistress; Antipho of the *Eunuchus* (539-614) is quite colorless except for mild curiosity and well-bred good nature.<sup>2</sup> Cyamus of the *Truculentus* employs song to boast of thefts (559-67), and the quarrel motif to reveal loyalty and audacity. The *puer* in *Pseudolus* 767-89 speaks a solo. Sophrona of the *Arbitrants* (522-31) is characterized chiefly by a scolding intended for her which her old master rehearses in solo. Only the last is significant from the point of view of either content or technique.

A third group, having still more important parts, includes such secondary characters as Lydus, in the *Bacchides*; or Davos, one of the disputants in the *Arbitrants*; or Charinus, of the *Pseudolus*. In the case of the last named, significant technique includes an anticipatory description of the kind of man needed to assist the intriguer, followed later, when he appears, with an approximate repetition of the descrip-

<sup>1</sup> Wagner, *De nuntiis comicis* (Breslau, 1913), pp. 46-49, mentions some traits of some of these rôles and the means used to reveal them.

<sup>2</sup> Donatus' commendation of Terence for introducing Antipho is based on his substitution of dialogue for monologue, not on his characterization of the rôle (Karsten, *Commenti Donatiani* [Lugduni Batavorum, 1912], I, 175, ad *Eun.* 539).

tion and his claim that it describes him. He then assists in giving an anticipatory description of another character. The deposed pedagogue Lydus of the *Bacchides* reveals himself more fully. He has parts in three scenes, in two of which his character finds expression through his reaction to his former charge. Exclamatory horror, shocked expostulation, offended dignity, admonition, and threats reveal the strait-laced pedagogue. His first scene, in dialogue, abounds in contrast with his former pupil. In his second he utters a speech of horrified disapproval directed at the persons within the house from which he has entered. The use of his reaction to persons and situations is unusually skilful technique. In his third scene, in dialogue with the youth's father, contrast is again prominent. A discussion of old and new principles of rearing youth, admonitions directed to his old master, shocked narratives of the young man's disgraceful conduct, approving description of a model youth—all emphasize the dominant traits of the type; but with all this wealth of detail, individualizing side lights are nevertheless missing. The same can be said of Pardalisca in the *Casina*, Syncerastus in the *Poenulus*, and in a measure even of Davos in the *Arbitrants*, although he is portrayed with delicacy and fulness. His demands, threats, arguments, his voiced suspicions, his repeated protests, his would-be sly devices, raise him somewhat above the level of a type.<sup>1</sup>

The fourth group is not truly inorganic; it consists of less prominent members of some of the pairs that appear often in Roman comedy. In general these rôles are not presented with much vividness or detail. Pamphila of the *Stichus*, Anterastilis of the *Poenulus*, and Philoxenus of the *Bacchides* are exceptions; but even so, although contrast with their sisters gives Pamphila and Anterastilis a degree of individuality, actually the differentiation is very slight, especially in the case of the former. Philoxenus reveals only the typical traits of the easy-going, philandering father. Chaeribulus (*Epidicus*) is remembered as an *adsentator*, Apoecides (*Epidicus*) for his pomposity, Charmides (*Rudens*) for deserting his host. The technique of these portraits shows some details worthy of note; Chaeribulus, the yes-man, berates or praises Epidicus according to the shifting moods of

<sup>1</sup> The individuality of his language is commented on by Wilamowitz, *Das Schiedsgericht* (Berlin, 1925), p. 160.

his friend. Myrrhina, too (*Casina*), is self-contradictory; she lectures her friend on a wife's duty of submissive patience, then with obvious pleasure assists in the discomfiture of her friend's husband. The pomposity of Apocides is most vividly revealed by his friend's gratuitous attack on him for this quality (*Epid.* 522-25). The Prologue of the *Rudens* in narrating the events antecedent to the play comments on the treason and perfidy of Charmides, the whole of whose real connection with the plot precedes the beginning of the action.<sup>1</sup> In other respects the technique used for these rôles is similar to what I have already discussed.

Those inorganic rôles of this group which are intended chiefly to promote comic incident have certain features in common. They consist of members of definite groups or professions—parasites, cooks, and slaves sent often on purposeless errands, besides a few miscellaneous persons. So far as they are characterized, they are caricatured and the comedy of their scenes depends on the caricatures. The technique for characterizing the members of any given group is surprisingly uniform, even in plays that are adaptations from different Greek authors.

Recurrent characteristics of the parasites are (1) their gluttony, (2) their propensity to solicit invitations, (3) their fawning, (4) their ability at entertaining, and (5) their abject lack of self-respect.<sup>2</sup> Among the parasites whom we know from the extant plays, these traits appear in varying combinations. In *Ergasilus* (*Captivi*) traits 1, 2, and 5 stand out; in *Gnatho* (*Eunuchus*), 1, 2, and 3; in *Gelasimus* (*Stichus*), 1, 2, and 4; in the parasite of the *Bacchides*, 5; in the *Boeotia*, 1. The most striking technique, used almost as often as the rôle is used, is the long self-descriptive solo speech in which the subject tells his name, comments on the difficulties of his profession, or recounts ad-

<sup>1</sup> In a few other instances the Prologue is used to sketch character, in two or three instances of inorganic rôles; for instance, the girl in the *Aulularia*. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1912), pp. 210-11, speaks of the use of the Prologue to describe character in the *Poenulus*, and in the *Aulularia* and *Rudens*.

<sup>2</sup> The character of the parasite is analyzed fully in Ribbeck, *Kolax* (Leipzig, 1883), esp. chap. iv. He gives a history and definition of the term and of the characteristic in life and literature, defines varieties of kolakes, analyzes all characteristic traits, and the acts and words which express them. Although not a study of dramatic technique, it is suggestive and complete for this purpose. Giese, *De parasiti persona* (Berlin, 1908), deals descriptively and historically with the character of the parasite, esp. chap. ii, pp. 5-24. Cf. also Legrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-99.



ventures in the pursuit of it. Gelasimus varies the formula by holding a fake auction of himself and his jokebooks; Gnatho, by boasting of his new type of parasitic activity, and by withholding his name until the end, when he introduces it incidentally. Gelasimus' solo is further varied by the presence of an eavesdropper who comments on his actions and character (cf. *Stich.* 217). Of Ergasilus' three solos (*Captivi*) two are stereotyped; the third is one long exuberant exclamation of joy. Both the characterizations of the parasites and the comic effects depend on the material in these solos.

By taking part in the incidents of the plays the parasites express themselves more fully. Gelasimus expresses a crescendo of joy at Pinacium's news that his old patron has returned, ending in discomfited petulance at the report that he has brought his own parasites with him. The indicated action assists the revelation—Gelasimus sweeps away dirt and cobwebs in joyous preparation, then in exasperation sweeps them back. Later he tries to touch first one brother then the other for an invitation, accepting ever worse indignities until his attitude is summed up by Epignomus (625–27):

di immortales! hicquidem pol summam in crucem  
cena aut prandio perduci potest. *Gel.*: ita ingenium meumst:  
quicumuis depugno multo facilius quam cum fame.

This picture of Gelasimus (based on a Menandrian model) shows more variety of technique and fulness of detail than those of other parasites.

The cooks<sup>1</sup> make less impression on one's memory. Their stereotyped traits are either named, as by Ballio in *Pseudolus* 794: *multi- loquom, gloriosum, insulsum, inutilem*; or are assumed as part of their professional equipment, ascribed to them and often admitted, as in *Pseudolus* 850–52; *Aulularia* 344–49, 363–70, 464; and *Casina* 720–23. They appear usually in dialogue scenes, in which they exhibit their boastful, grandiloquent natures, admit the tendency to thievery, and sometimes, as in *Curculio* 251–73, illustrate their charlatanry in other matters. The rôle of the cook is almost exclusively devoted to comic caricature.

<sup>1</sup> Ribbeck, *Alazon* (Leipzig, 1882), gives a history of the word in literature, and of the character in life and literature; he discusses rôles which display alazoneia, including cooks, whose traits and the expression of them he describes from the point of view of content (pp. 18–26).

The inorganic slaves<sup>1</sup> are used as vehicles of witticisms and badi-nage. Crocotium and Pinacium in the *Stichus* make game of Gelasimus, and indulge in amusing repartee or solos; Paegnium and Sophoclidisca of the *Persa* have a long scene full of pert dialogue; Paegnium is amusingly pert to his master, his master's friend, and his master's enemy. They reveal inquisitiveness by demands and questions; Pinacium shows comic boastfulness in the demands he says he should make. In general, the group leaves an impression of pertness, but little more. In technique I have mentioned Crocotium's eavesdropping comments, which assist in the revelation of Gelasimus also, and Pinacium's long, amusing solo. These slaves are often speakers in dialogue scenes, where they can more easily be witty. I should add Sophoclidisca's description of what she is not like, spoken as she enters to her mistress who is offstage (*Per.* 168-70)—technique used once by Lydus (*Bacch.* 368 ff.).

Among the miscellaneous rôles the *Choragus* of the *Curculio* is not characterized at all; Lurcio of the *Miles gloriosus* is simply drunk. The *Piscatores* of *Rudens* 290-305 describe in song their life and occupation, without rancor, without returning Trachalio's abuse; from what they do not say they leave an impression of dogged patience; but this may be fanciful exaggeration on my part. The *Advocati* of *Phormio* 441-59 are vividly sketched by the advice each gives, couched in terms pompous and deliberate, and beginning in every instance with an emphatic first personal pronoun, by means of which their egotism is emphasized to the point of caricature, as with the other members of the group.

Among the persons toward the close of a play who are loosely attached to the plot are found what may be called the "catastrophic rôle," and a group of persons who assist in the dénouement, and a few very incidental *pueri* or others of little dramatic value. In the last group is the *puer* of *Miles gloriosus* 1378-93, who offers exaggerated flattery to the soldier as he summons him within doors; there is no characterization save that of the pert boy. Here is found the *puer* of *Captivi* 909-21 whose rôle is innocent of even that characterization. Here belong also Stephanium and Sagarinus of the *Stichus*, who en-

<sup>1</sup> Legrand, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-27.

liven the drinking bout with song, dance, and jest. In short, the group consists of expressionless pawns.

The assistants to the dénouement are likewise treated sketchily, with a few significant exceptions. The *Nutrix* of *Eunuchus* 910-17, who is dragged on to recognize the tokens, is reproached for her slow gait; the *Nutrix* of *Heauton* 616-17 lacks even that much characterization. Demipho of *Cistellaria* 774-81 is colorless except for one salacious witticism, and Laches of *Eunuchus* 971-96 is dismissed almost as unceremoniously. Cario, the cook of *Miles* 1394-1427, is bloodthirsty and avaricious, as his threats show. Bromia, the messenger of *Amphitruo* 1053-1120, describes extravagant panic at a time when she should reasonably have recovered, and stands up boldly to her master to defend her mistress' honor. The parasite of *Diabolus* in *Asinaria* 746 ff. is caricatured. He differs little from other parasites, except that he speaks no solo; he toadies abjectly, surpasses even his master's coarseness; in an aside he names his greed as the motive of his abjectness, like Artotrogus of the *Miles*. All these are stereotyped traits belonging to the rôles in question.

The significant exception occurs in the *Truculentus* (775-853), where the maid who with Syra is introduced to give evidence is well developed, of course in proportion to her importance. Sullen obstinacy and loyalty to her mistress may be read in the beatings she has suffered and with which she is still threatened; a sense of justice not too often met prompts her to boldness, revealed by her demand that responsibility for her mistress' trouble be laid on the man, and by her comment that the culprit stands free while she, the witness, is bound, and by her disobeying her master to explain a confusing statement of Syra's; it prompts her, too, to express scorn for the cowardly effort of the culprit to escape notice. All this, which quite adequately delineates the girl, is accomplished with a minimum of space and action, by a half-dozen speeches—demands and comments. Syra is less sharply drawn.

Not infrequently among the persons and incidents that constitute the complication the author has failed to prepare factors or characters to resolve it. Sometimes then toward the close of a play he introduces an entirely new character to serve this purpose; occasionally it is

someone who has been mentioned earlier, who is, to the extent of such preparation, less inorganic than those who are lugged in without previous warning. This is the catastrophic rôle. Lumping the inorganic with the less inorganic of these and examining them from the point of view of character, we find the same three groups as in other cases; only here, significantly enough, the emphasis has swung to the group of those who are more fully portrayed, as if the poet, recognizing the awkwardness of his dramatic technique, were endeavoring in this most important of inorganic rôles to render it as little objectionable as possible, to secure the acceptance of the person involved both by the other persons of the play and by the audience, so as to make his interference seem the natural outcome of character and causative circumstances rather than the functioning of a mechanical formula, a *homo ex machina*.<sup>1</sup>

Among representatives of the catastrophic rôle, Halisca of the *Cistellaria*, by the exaggeration of her ineffectiveness, is portrayed as a caricature, a comic character tragic to herself. The technique, i.e., her long solo, is clear proof that the author was more interested in the comic and musical possibilities of the rôle than in characterizing it. Charmides of the *Trinummus*, unless the indispensable minimum told of him in the exposition is thought to reveal character, is endowed with only the one trait needed to resolve the plot—inquisitiveness. He refers to this himself when at a surprisingly unconvincing moment he turns aside to eavesdrop on two peculiar strangers. Then a simple accusation and denial suffice to resolve the plot. The discursiveness and alliterative exuberance of his first solo brand him as a comic type; solo and dialogue alike are innocent of character delineation. Diabolus of the *Asinaria* is another caricature playing the catastrophic rôle; in his case jealous vengeance is used to resolve the plot. The contract which is used to reveal this quality is important as technique.

The second group is unimportant and small in numbers. Dromo in *Adelphoe* 776 gives away to Demea the secret of his son's debauch-

<sup>1</sup> Callidamates of the *Mostellaria*, though not playing the catastrophic rôle, is used mechanically to solve some of the complications. The characterization of the rôle is extremely slight. At vs. 313 he enters in a state of intoxication which furnishes amusement sporadically for the next hundred lines. This cannot be regarded as characterizing him. At vs. 1122 he enters as *precator* and obtains the pardon of Philolaches and Tranio, and again reveals no well-defined characteristics, except those of the well-bred young man apologizing for an admitted fault.

ery and so resolves the plot. No characterization is offered. Lyconides' slave in the *Aulularia* (587 ff.) is introduced by a trite song on the duties of the good slave. Typical slave traits are revealed by his attitude toward Euclio, his actions on the stage or reported in solo. Even his *naïveté* in trusting the secret of his finding a pot of gold to his master, immediately followed to be sure by a sly attempt to correct his error, reappears in at least one other slave rôle, that of Gripus in the *Rudens*. Only the large number of monologues in the rôle arrests our attention.

The third group is more significant. Here we find Phaniscus and Pinacium of the *Mostellaria*, who are mentioned earlier in the play (and so are less inorganic), and Gripus of the *Rudens*, Callicles of the *Truculentus*, and Crito of the *Andria*, who enter with no preparation at all. The characterization of Phaniscus and Pinacium is accomplished first through the former's topical song on the good slave, then through their duet and the contrast between them, the one flaunting his obedience in the face of his fellow, the other employing taunts and abuse, in jealous envy. The contrast is carried through the following scene, in which Theopropides first addresses Pinacium, scorning Phaniscus as *delicatus*, then because of the former's surliness turns back to the latter. Incidentally, Theopropides summarizes the contrast, saying to Phaniscus (947): *puere, nimium delicatu's*; then (949): *nam te esse arbitror puerum probum*; and to Pinacium (955): *tu ne molestus's*. The characterization is in no way needed for the part they are to play; colorless pawns would have served as well; this indicates, as do other rôles in the same play, a real interest in characterization for its own sake.

The rôle of Gripus of the *Rudens* (906 ff.) is extended far beyond the space warranted by its importance. He enters, mechanically introduced, singing a long topical song full of self-description. He sings of the advantages of being energetic, applying the traits of which he approves to himself with a narrative of his night's fishing. This leads easily into a happy reverie of freedom, luxury, and fame, based on the unknown contents of a *vidulus* he has fished up. Energy, loyalty, and ambition are traits he ascribes to himself; he does not recognize the dreamy impracticality of his ambition. A long quarrel with another slave shows him slow, stupid, obstinate, greedy, with the slyness of

the stupid man; the motif of a hypothetical case, employed by Gripus' adversary, deserves notice. Gripus is on the stage almost continuously throughout the rest of the play. An arbitration scene shows all his worst traits, by demands, caviling, interruptions; a dispute with Labrax shows him trying to make the best of a bad bargain, dickering with and victimized by the more clever rascal; a dispute with his master shows that he is at least sincere in his position. So much pains are taken to present a picture of Gripus, although he is needed only to discover the *vidulus* and make its contents known. He also is a comic character; but the comedy does not rest on caricature; the character is drawn for its own sake.

In the *Truculentus* the catastrophic rôle is played by Callicles, the father of the girl whose illegitimate child figures in the intrigue. There is no hint of his existence until he enters to conduct an inquisition of his maid (775-853); and he does not reappear thereafter; but within his seventy-five verses he is well characterized. Threats of punishment, coupled with a reference to himself as lenient and quiet-tempered, reminders of earlier punishment, harsh directness of manner, extreme brevity in putting his interrogations—all reveal uncompromising sternness; he recognizes the validity of the excuse which the maid offers, but refuses to accept it; when the culprit pleads drunkenness to extenuate his crime, Callicles enunciates the principle that men of honor are not overmastered by their wine but masters of it. The same high-minded justice is revealed in his reaction to the maid's protest that the culprit is not bound, while she, the witness, is: he orders her released at once; and again in his dealings with the culprit. His abrupt advice to Diniarchus to claim and rear his child further shows his stern sense of justice. These actions, words, and manner constitute the technique of his portraiture; and these are skillfully invented to display character while they serve the needs of the plot, not to fulfil the latter requirement only. The whole treatment of Callicles is full and individual, sufficient to make the rôle convincing, but not so extended as to seem to have run away with the poet.

The rôle of Crito in the *Andria* is similarly satisfying.<sup>1</sup> He also

<sup>1</sup> Karsten, *op. cit.*, I, 94, *ad* vs. 796, appreciates this excellence: "in hoc loco persona ad catastropham machinata nunc loquitur, nam hic Crito nihil argumento debet nisi absolutionem erroris eius; simul ex verbis suis quam gravis quam modestus sit quamque iustus ostendit."



enters without preparation.<sup>1</sup> A brief solo gives his identity and business; a slave of the household promptly recognizes him, and in dialogue the facts needed for the dénouement are disclosed naturally. One rather long speech which explains his unwillingness to enter on the inheritance mentions the fact that he does not wish to impoverish Chrysis' foster-sister. The poet's purpose in writing the lines, unnecessary for the plot, was obviously to emphasize his kindly, generous nature—a characterization made more explicit and carried beyond the limits of the play by the slave's comment which recognizes a well-known trait (817): "o optime hospes! pol, Crito, antiquom obtines."<sup>2</sup> The general impression of his character is further emphasized two scenes later by brief phrases of approbation on the part of the slave Davus, who has witnessed his actions offstage. Then follows a clear description of him by Davus to his master (855-57):

nescio qui senex modo uenit, ellum, confidens, catus:  
quom faciem uideas, uidetur esse quantuius preti:  
tristis seueritas inest in uoltu atque in uerbis fides.

As Crito enters from Chrysis' house, his words of reassurance to the persons within confirm the impression; supplementary confirmation comes from the recognition of him and warm greeting from an old friend Chremes, a principal character of the play, who, when Crito is accused of sycophancy, vouches for him (914-15):

si, Simo, hunc noris satis,  
non ita arbitrare: bonus est hic uir.

He has strength as well as goodness; when the accusations continue, he retorts (920): "si mihi perget quae uolt dicere, ea quae non uolt audiet"; and finally by the dignity of his bearing and the accuracy of his statements he wins the trust even of his accuser. As to technical devices, the entrance solo is merely a method of getting him on the

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 13, *ad* vs. 71, claims that the expression *cognatorum neclegentia* used of Chrysis is in preparation for the appearance of Crito. The phrase is, however, too vague and incidental to constitute adequate preparation for a specific person; it explains Chrysis' position and saves her from too-great reproach for her manner of living. At best, it informs us that she had relatives.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 96, *ad*, vs. 817: "absolute dixit, ut aequum aut bonum, quod antiqui solebant." But cf. *Heaut. tim.* 434-35, "hoc timet, ne tua duritia antiqua illa etiam adaucta sit," where *antiqua* recognizes a trait which was familiar earlier in life, as in this passage of the *Andria*. Cf. also *Hec.* 92, "antiqua ut consuetudine agitare inter uos libere conuiuium," in the same meaning.

stage; the characterization is adequately worked out by a variety of means: the subject's own report of his reaction to the situation; direct naming of traits by two or three other characters; actions, manner, and expression of opinions that verify the traits named; and this characterization is accomplished, like that of Callicles in the *Truculentus*, by the very words that carry on the action of the plot. Of Callicles, however, there is no description in set adjectives, as there is of Crito.<sup>1</sup>

The catastrophic rôle as a whole is more carefully characterized than other inorganic rôles taken as a whole; the technique ranges from the mechanical and inartistic self-description in solo to the artistic revelations of Crito and Callicles by means of acts, sentiments, manner of speaking, reactions to situations, and brief summarizing descriptions such as naturally find a place on the lips of other characters.

A final group of inorganic persons consists of those who never appear at all, but are referred to by persons in the play. All persons so referred to are included here, although actually some of them would be organic if ever they did appear. Naturally, these characterizations are slight; but one is impressed by the extreme flimsiness of even those which seem important to the plot—the sweethearts who are the center of the action. Such description as is accorded them is largely physical, and incidental at that. In the *Eunuchus* the girl is *facie honesta* (230) and *non malum* (274); in the *Phormio* she is *facie egregia* (100) and *liberalis* (905) and *perliberalis* (815), implying certainly no more than good breeding. In the *Casina* the girl is described by the Prologus as *pudica et libera, ingenua Atheniensis, neque quicquam stupri faciet* (81–83), and by another character as *bellam et tenellam* (108). In the *Aulularia* (23–25) also the Prologus introduces the girl, but carries the characterization further by describing her customary acts of piety. The *Andria* and *Hecyra*<sup>2</sup> give fuller pictures; in the former

<sup>1</sup> Hanno in the *Poenulus*, who furnishes the title for the play, cannot be regarded as inorganic; but except for the narrative of his activity given in the Prologue, there is no hint of his existence until vs. 930, when he enters and plays a part similar to the catastrophic rôle. He is described by a few adjectives in the Prologue (111–13); his part from vs. 930 to the end of the play contains little characterization. The anomalous position of Hanno in the play raises the question of contamination; for a discussion of this see Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 169–79.

<sup>2</sup> Siess, *op. cit.*, XXVIII (1906), 240–41.

(117-36) Simo describes her physical appearance, and relates her emotion at the funeral of Chrysis; in 236-300 Pamphilus' anxiety and despondency, and his account of how he received her from her foster-sister, imply lovable qualities; but that is all. Philumena of the *He-cyra* is treated at greater length; the slave describes her as she impressed her husband (164-66):

haec, ita uti liberali esse ingenio decet,  
pudens modesta, incommoda atque iniurias  
uiri omnis ferre et tegere contumelias.

Twice later the lover refers to her, naming the same patience. Furthermore, her actions and her husband's acquired affection for her are tributes to her goodness. This is the fullest delineation in the extant Roman comedies of a sweetheart who does not appear; and here even more than in the other comedies she is the focal center of the action. To sum up, in these rôles, besides the usual description in adjectives spoken by one of the other characters or by the Prologus (and the employment of the Prologus is significant of mechanical technique), there is employed in three plays an incidental report of the girl's actions which may indicate character. The entire sum of characterization is both meagre and mechanical.

Some very incidental characters are portrayed in passing by reports of their actions. Moschion's mother comes to life in the few crisp sentences quoted from her by the slave in the *Perikeiromene* (128-35). In the *Phormio* (91-103) Geta's story of the anonymous youth who first called their attention to Phanium is full of details which portray an emotional nature lacking the initiative to transfer his emotion into action. In the *Andria* the story of Chrysis is told by the lover and his father. Her hard struggle to live *pudice* (74), her adopting the profession of courtesan, her maternal solicitude for her foster-sister, her dying injunction to Pamphilus, make a vivid picture of her in very few strokes—so vivid that a recent novel has appeared devoted to her who in the *Andria* occupies some twenty-five verses. In the *Bacchides* the intriguer invents a monstrous tale of crime, full of specific details, which portray Archidemides, and he reinforces the tale with such adjectives as *scelestiozem nullum* (257) and *auidi* (276). In the same narrative he includes Theotimus, who we have no reason to suppose exists at all, of whom it is reported that the soles of his shoes are of

gold—a detail full of implications of character, whether he is fictitious or real. Saurea of the *Asinaria* is impersonated on the stage after being characterized in vague but uncomplimentary terms. In the impersonation Leonida employs self-important boasts, bursts of temper, domineering commands and comments, the effect of which is summarized by an observer (410): *nimis imperiosus*. In this group a narrative reporting action or manner of life is the commonest technique, sometimes pieced out with adjectives. The use of impersonation in the *Asinaria* is significant.

The most completely incidental persons, who are barely mentioned, may be left utterly colorless, as are Chremes' neighbors in the *Heauton timorumenos* (498–501); or may be dismissed with a few adjectives of purely physical description, as is the girl offered to Clitipho in the same play (1060–62); or with a few words of characterization, as in the case of Strabax' father in *Truculentus* 309–10:

As. estne item uiolentus ut tu? Tr. non enim ille meretriculis  
moenerandis rem coegit, uerum parsimonia duritiaque.

Antiphila's mother in the *Heauton* (276 ff.), Polymachaeroplages in the *Pseudolus* (992–96), and others are treated to an adjective at least, sometimes to five or six lines. This attention to the least important of all the persons of a play indicates a real interest in presenting vivid pictures, even though that interest is often satisfied with portrayals of which a large element is physical description, and the characteristics, when indicated, are stereotyped.

Almost every rôle in Roman comedy, however insignificant, is given some description. Interest in character sufficed to endow even incidental rôles with some definite traits, to develop some rôles in considerable detail, even among those loosely attached to the main action, and to raise a character here and there above the level of types into an individualized person.

Perhaps the most striking technique employed, and the most mechanical, is the monologue or monody, which is almost always used in parasite rôles, and frequently in slave rôles. Equally mechanical is the description of a character by the Prologus, technique employed in a few instances, in which at the time of the first entrance of some person who is important for the plot it is difficult to bring out the characteristics which the poet wishes to emphasize. This is a mechanical

solution of a difficulty which often was solved more artistically. Prolonged conversations on semi-irrelevant material, intended as character-scenes to delineate more important rôles, characterize also the incidental speakers which appear in them; the *Mostellaria*, *Poenulus*, and *Stichus* contain illustrations. Other prolonged conversations, composed for expository purposes, are utilized to delineate a large number of inorganic speakers. Adjectives are used freely, not only in the Prologue, but also by one speaker of another, usually under well-motivated circumstances; occasionally a type is described, the description preceding the entrance of the person described; on other occasions a description summarizes the impression which the poet wishes to make. The use of an eavesdropper for this purpose, who by his comments both reveals himself and summarizes the character of others, is effective. Also, professions are described. Actions of course indicate character by illustrating it, including such activities as uttering speeches which contain admonition, advice, command, complaint, boasts, flatteries, wishes, witticisms, the statement of preferences and principles, and all the types of discourse that compose the dialogue. Contrast is employed frequently and effectively. Very significant is the expression of reactions to situations, occurrences, and persons, by which the speaker reveals himself; for such technique is at the opposite pole of skilful artistry from the mechanical solo and perfunctory adjectives.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## TWO UNREPORTED PERSIUS MANUSCRIPTS

BY DOROTHY M. ROBATHAN

EVER since 1868 when Jahn published his second edition of Persius, it has been generally agreed that the most important manuscripts for the text of this author are three of the ninth century, two of which are at Montpellier (Nos. 125 and 212) and the other is in the archives of St. Peter's in Rome (Vat. H. 36). At the same time the fact was recognized that these three manuscripts represent two distinct text traditions, since P (Mont. 125) in many ways differs from A and B (Mont. 212 and Vat. H. 36, respectively), whose common archetype is known as  $\alpha$ .<sup>1</sup> This has for some time been known erroneously as the "Sabinian recension."<sup>2</sup>

Jahn, followed by Buecheler, in establishing his text, considered that in places where P and  $\alpha$  differed, preference was to be given to the readings of  $\alpha$ . In 1890, however, Bieger published a monograph<sup>3</sup> championing the cause of P, in which he showed that in many places the  $\alpha$  reading substituted by Buecheler for that of P was inferior, that in the case of  $\alpha$  the method of correction was obvious, and that in eighteen places where the reading of either was admissible, that of P was more likely to be genuine and should be used instead of that which Buecheler had inserted in his text. Leo, in revising the Jahn-Buecheler editions, carried out this scheme of substitution, and preference to P has also been given by such editors as Owen, Villeneuve, Santi Consoli, and Cartault.

Ramorino, however, in editing the Paravia edition of Persius,<sup>4</sup> made use of two Laurentian manuscripts which he had previously classified<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A study of A and B has proved that neither was copied from the other, but their points of similarity, such as agreement in error, the position of the choliambics after the satires, and the Sabinus subscription in each, make it evident that they go back to a common parent.

<sup>2</sup> Since Lindsay (*Class. Rev.*, XXIX [1915], 112-13) made the discovery that the subscription in these manuscripts is from the same hand as the corrections and not by the hand that did the text, it is clear that all that we can accurately term "Sabinian" are the readings put in by the second hand.

<sup>3</sup> Joannes Bieger, *De A. Persii Flacci Cod. Pith. C Recte Aestimando* (Berlin, 1890).

<sup>4</sup> Ramorino (Torino, 1918).

<sup>5</sup> In *Stud. it. di fil. class.*, XII (1904), 229 ff.



as belonging to a mixed tradition ( $\lambda$ ) which inclines more to the  $\alpha$ <sup>1</sup> than to the P family. He therefore lays down the principle that where  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  (to which he applies the term *recensio emendata*, which also includes a number of other manuscripts) agree as against P, that agreement is to be considered authoritative.<sup>2</sup>

That this question of whether  $\alpha$  or P is to be used as the basis for the text of Persius is of highest importance is evident from a comparison of Leo's edition with that of Ramorino. In fifty-one places there is a difference in the text due to the fact that in one case P's reading has been preferred, while in the other, either that of  $\alpha$  or  $\lambda$  or of  $\alpha$  alone has been substituted. How are we to determine which branch of the family tree is more likely to be genuine? That both P and  $\alpha$  contain many errors is obvious. Some of these are the results of the scribes' carelessness while others had their source in emendation or in the insertion of glosses into the text. A study which Bieger made of these errors led to the conclusion that for the most part those in  $\alpha$  were easier to explain and that the P reading, often representing the *lectio difficilior*, was rejected by the corrector in favor of something more obvious. An example of this may be found in Prologue 5, where  $\alpha$  substitutes *ambiunt* for the more difficult *lambunt*.

Since Lindsay's discovery that the second hand in A and B is all that we have of the Sabinus recension,<sup>3</sup> a new interest is felt in the corrections in these manuscripts. Owen<sup>4</sup> has carefully reported the readings of the second hand in A, and although it seems likely that B bears similar corrections, until that manuscript has been studied with this question in mind we shall have to depend on Owen's report for any conclusions that we may draw about Sabinus' recension. A study of these corrections with a view to deciding whether Sabinus' manuscript more closely resembled  $\alpha$  or P is not very fruitful. Most of the A<sup>2</sup> readings are corrections of obvious errors and of course, as

<sup>1</sup> Ramorino persists in using the erroneous term "Sabinian" in referring to  $\alpha$ .

<sup>2</sup> That he does not bind himself strictly to this rule, however, is seen in the fact that in v. 78 where  $\alpha\lambda$  have *temporis* and P has *turbinis*, he uses the latter in his text, and again in vi. 77 where *plausisse* is found in P and *pavisse* in  $\alpha\lambda$  he recognizes the superiority of P.

<sup>3</sup> So far as I know, no other Persius manuscripts have been reported which contain the Sabinus subscription.

<sup>4</sup> S. G. Owen, "On the Montpellier MSS. of Persius and Juvenal," *Class. Rev.*, XIX (1905), 218-23.

such, agree with P. There are cases, however, where A<sup>2</sup> does not agree with P. Such readings as v. 123 *bathyllo* A *beatilli* P *bathilli* Sab.; vi. 68 *angue* A *surge* P *ungue* Sab. show independent error on the part of P, and it is likely that its archetype had the correct reading which Sab. gives. In other cases *a* and P agree in error and the Sab. corrector supplies the correct reading. Examples of this are: ii. 55 *subit* PA *subiit* Sab.; iii. 20 *etfluis* PA *effluis* Sab.; iv. 19 *in hunc* PA *i nunc* Sab.<sup>1</sup> There are still other instances, however, where the P reading agreeing with A was the correct one for which the erroneous one was substituted. Such cases are: i. 76 *quem* PA *quam* Sab. iii. 23 *est* PA *es* Sab.; iii. 86 *populus* PA *populis* Sab.; vi. 43 *bone* PA *bene* Sab. In dealing with this subject we must remember that the subscription plainly says "temptavi emendare sine antigrapho meum" and therefore too much weight should not be attached to these emendations. A significant entry, however, is found in v. 26, where *fauces*, the P reading, is given by A<sup>2</sup> for *voces*, which *a* and *λ* both have. Also in i. 57 the corrector changes *protenso* in *a* (a possible reading here) to *propenso*, which is found in both P and *λ*. While these examples may point to a possible relationship between Sabinus' manuscript and P, they are not striking enough to justify a positive statement to that effect.

A glance at the earliest fragmentary manuscript of Persius (Vat. 5750), of the fourth century, which contains merely verses 53–104 of the first satire, shows, however, that it supports the P reading in two significant places:<sup>2</sup> i. 59 *imitari* P<sup>1</sup>E *imitata est* *aλP*<sup>2</sup> and i. 69 *docemus* P<sup>1</sup>E *videmus* *aλP*<sup>2</sup>. Less important is its agreement with P in i. 87 *bellum hoc hoc bellum* where *a* reads *bellum hoc bellum* and *λ* has *bellum hoc bellum est*, and in i. 96 where *a* alone has *vertice* as against *cortice* of all the other manuscripts.

But although we may agree after investigation that so far no adequate reasons have been brought forth for preferring *a* to P as the basis for the text,<sup>3</sup> it is nevertheless true that P in a few places shows

<sup>1</sup> B is reported here, in Leo's apparatus, as having *i nunc*. It is likely that a further examination of the hands in this manuscript would lead to the conclusion that in B, as in its sister, this reading comes from the corrector's hand.

<sup>2</sup> My reports on E (Vat. 5750) as well as on P throughout this paper are taken from Leo's edition (Berlin, 1910).

<sup>3</sup> Ramorino's assertion (*op. cit.*, pp. 253–54) that the archetype of *a* was written in Visigothic script has little significance. Even if this conjecture be true, there is no reason for supposing that *a* represents an earlier tradition than P. We may also bear in mind the fact that P is the supreme authority for the text of Juvenal.

the results of interpolations which cannot be accepted as genuine. The most conspicuous among these errors is to be found in Prologue 14, where *nectar*, which *a* reads, has given way to *melos* in both P and the *recensio emendata*. Other examples of glosses which have crept into the text of P are i. 61 *ius*; v. 176 *tollit*; vi. 9 *pretium*. Moreover, as Ramorino has pointed out,<sup>1</sup> there are about thirty places where the readings of neither *a* nor P can be correct. It is in this situation that the so-called lesser manuscripts which represent the mixed tradition are of use.

It is a well-known fact that comparatively few of the later manuscripts of Persius which are widely scattered throughout European libraries have as yet been studied. Ramorino classifies as belonging to the *recensio emendata* along with his two Laurentian manuscripts (La, 37. 19 and Lr, 68. 24) one from Trèves (No. 1089);<sup>2</sup> one from Oxford (Bodl. Auct. F.I, 15) and one from Cambridge (Trin. Coll. IV. 10);<sup>3</sup> and one in the British Museum (Reg. 15 B XIX).<sup>4</sup> Since all these manuscripts have *melos* in place of *nectar* (Prol. 14), since the titles of the satires agree with those in *a* rather than in P, since they have the Prologue before the satires rather than at the end as in *a*, Ramorino considers that they represent an archetype  $\lambda$  which was a mixture of *a* and P (but closer to *a*) and that the two Laurentian manuscripts are closer to each other than to the other five.<sup>5</sup>

Before considering further the relationship of the manuscripts which we have been discussing, I should like to call attention to two hitherto-unpublished manuscripts in the Reginensis collection in the Vatican, collations of which are to be found at the end of this paper.<sup>6</sup> Reg. Lat. 1562 was written on parchment in Caroline minuscules at the end of the tenth or beginning of the eleventh century. Indications of early date, aside from the general unevenness of the letters, are the frequent NT and NS ligatures, uncertain word division, thick shafts on the upright letters, one example of an open *a* (fol. 11v.), and, its most conspicuous feature, the fact that the letters *i* and *a* are

<sup>1</sup> *Praef.*, p. xii.

<sup>2</sup> Published by Dal Zotto in *Stud. it. fil. class.*, XIV (1906), 105-8.

<sup>3</sup> Both used by Owen in his editions published at Oxford, 1903 and 1907.

<sup>4</sup> Reported by Bentley in *Class. Jour.* (London, 1818).

<sup>5</sup> See stemma in Preface to Ramorino's edition, p. xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Neither of these manuscripts is among those mentioned by Jahn in the 1843 edition, nor by Santi Consoli (Rome, 1905 and 1911).

commonly written subscript after *m*, *n*, and *h*. This same characteristic may be observed in the well-known Bern Horace, and in other manuscripts written by insular scribes, especially at St. Gall.<sup>1</sup> The fact that we find on the first folio in a late hand the words *Bibliotheca Schobingeri* leads to the conclusion that this manuscript was probably at one time in the abbey at St. Gall and may very likely have been written there. Schobinger was a native of St. Gall<sup>2</sup> into whose hands fell a number of the abbey manuscripts at the time of the Reformation.<sup>3</sup> A perusal of early catalogues of that monastery shows that at the end of the tenth century there was a Persius manuscript in the library,<sup>4</sup> and in a catalogue compiled in 1461 we find another Persius entry.<sup>5</sup> We cannot, of course, identify our manuscript with either of these, but it is possible that it was in the abbey library at either date.

The manuscript in its present form consists of the first seventeen folios of a composite codex. Folios 18-34 contain Ovid's *Ex ponto* ii, the original numbering of which began with folio 223, while the rest of the manuscript (fols. 34-57), which dates from the thirteenth to the fourteenth century, contains a variety of classical authors. Folio 1 of the Persius is blank except for the words *Id anima mea dñm* [= *dominum??*] *et exul* and a few scribblings, together with the ascription to Schobinger referred to above. At the bottom are the initials "B S" (for *Bibliotheca Schobingeri*) which are also repeated on folio 17. Folio 1v. contains the words *Incipit prefacio Persii* in capitals. On folio 2 the choliambics begin without any title, and the first satire is headed merely "Liber Persii" (in red). None of the satires have titles, although space has been left for them. The first satire is preceded by an *argumentum* beginning: "Fabulam tangit. Fortus rex tres filias gorgonas fertur habuisse, etc." The scholia and glosses are very full on folios 2-3v. and infrequent thereafter, and are in the same hand as the text. On folio 7 after the last satire occurs the word *finis*, followed

<sup>1</sup> For examples of this kind of writing see Anton Chroust, *Monumenta paleographica* (Munich, 1904), Serie I, Lief. XV, Taf. 4; Lief. XVI, Taf. 3-4, and W. M. Lindsay, *Paleographia Latina* (Oxford University Press, 1927), Part V, Pl. VII. Cf. also discussion by Lindsay, *op. cit.*, Part I, p. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Goldast, *Scriptores rerum Alemannicarum*, III, 3, for a brief life of Schobinger.

<sup>3</sup> P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* (Munich, 1918), p. 62.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 111.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 118.

by a brief *Vita* and some definitions of satire beginning: "Satira dicitur genus lancis.i.discus vel clarnus multis ac variis frugum generibus plena, etc." Throughout the text there are frequent variants and some corrections in the first hand. A second hand contemporary with the first, but for the most part readily distinguishable from it, has inserted a verse in the Prologue and made some corrections throughout. The insertion mark by this hand on folio 2 (a minuscule *d* with a line through it) is to be contrasted with that put in on folio 3 by *m*<sup>1</sup> (an uncial *dd* with a line through) where verse 46 was omitted in the text. The initial letters of the first and second satires are slightly ornate and are colored red and green, respectively, while those of the remaining satires are severely plain. That of Satire iv is in red while that of the third is in ink of the same color as the text, but it has been erased, although the outlines of the N which were originally there are clearly visible. The initial letters of the fifth and sixth are merely outlined.

That the scribe was often careless is evident from the number of corrections, many of them by the first hand, and by the frequent examples of inversion of the normal word order, especially in pairs of words (i. 16 *tandem natalicia*; i. 18 *collueris mobile*; i. 93 *didicit versum*; ii. 35 *macram spem*; iii. 86 *multum torosaque*, etc.). Omission of words, however, is rare, and in just one instance (which will be discussed later) is an entire verse left out (i. 46). Confusion of *p* and *b* is shown in i. 106 *bluteum*; iii. 16 *balumbo*; vi. 7 *intebet*. The letters *h* and *b* are very much alike and a hasty glance would often mistake one for the other, owing to the fact that the bow of the *h* curves almost to the shaft. A good example of this is to be found on folio 9v. (iii. 99) where the loop of the *h* in *sulphureas* is so completely closed that the word looks like *sulpbureas*.

A close examination of the readings found in R makes it clear that while this manuscript belongs to the mixed tradition as established by Ramorino it differs from the  $\lambda$  family in that its mixture bears more similarity to P than to  $\alpha$ . A study of 328 passages in which there is a variation of readings involved revealed that while La<sup>1</sup> agreed with  $\alpha$  alone 43 times, R agreed with P alone 46 times. There were 56

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of illustration we may take La as a representative member of its class, basing our statistics upon Ramorino's report of it.

instances where R agreed with La as against the readings of *a* and P. Again, while La stands alone 23 times, R has a unique reading 25 times. It is interesting to observe that whereas La agrees with P alone 18 times, R agrees with *a* alone 17 times. These figures give us a remarkably symmetrical diagram, showing that R is approximately as close to P as La is to *a* and is as far from *a* as La is from P.

Let us now look at the 36 passages in which *a* and La together represent a reading which differs from that of PR. Disregarding the cases in which either reading is possible, and considering only those in which there is no doubt as to which is correct, we find that La agrees with *a* in error 12 times, while R agrees with P in the wrong reading 11 times. The list on page 291, which includes all the cases where the *a* La readings on the one hand differ from PR on the other, serves to indicate the relationship between these manuscripts.

The foregoing investigation has dealt only with readings in the first hand in all of the manuscripts cited. A study of the corrections in the second hand in P makes it clear that the corrector had in his possession a codex of the *a*λ type. A consideration merely of the Prologue and of the first satire will substantiate this fact. The following readings which are assigned to P<sup>2</sup> agree as indicated below: Prol. 12 *refulgeat a* La; i. 6 *examenque a* La; i. 19 *Hic a* La; i. 66 *dirigat* La; i. 69 *videmus a* La; i. 74 *Quem a* La; i. 93 *didicit* La; i. 99 *torva mimalloneis* La.

The second hand in R, however, has corrected that manuscript to agree more nearly with P than it did in the beginning.<sup>1</sup> Especially significant are the R<sup>2</sup> readings v. 70 *te*; vi. 3 *rerum*; vi. 9 *cognoscere* vi. 46 *captis*, which are found in P alone. Of interest too is iii. 93, where R originally had the correct word *loturo*. The second hand changed the first *o* to an *a* and wrote a *u* above, whereas the first hand in P shows *laturo* changed from *luturo*. Exactly the same thing occurred in i. 73 where R originally had the correct *dentalia*, which R<sup>2</sup> changed to the erroneous *dentilia*. P had originally *dentalia* with an

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to observe that at one time the belief was held that P itself came from St. Gall (cf. Jahn, 1843, Proleg. cexiii). This theory originated from the fact that in 1759 Pius Kolb published a catalogue said to have been written in 1484, and no longer in existence (Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 148), which contained the word *Thebaidorum* in the title of the Persius entry. While there is no reason to believe that this referred to P itself, it is possible that a close relative of P with the same peculiar title was at that time in St. Gall, and that R was corrected, if not originally copied, from that manuscript.



expunging mark added later under the *a*. One other entry in the second hand is of interest though not for any connection with P. In

	<i>a</i> La	PR
Prol. 12	refulgeat	refulserit
14	pegaseum	p pegaseum
i. 6	examenque	examenve
32	circa	circum
44	fas est	feei
46-47	inv. ord.	rect. ord.
59	imitata est	imitari
74	Quem	Cum
81	istuc	istut P istud R
123	afflante	afflate
ii. 2	apponit	apponet
5	libabit	libavit
13	expungas	expungam P expugnam R
21	quod	quo
40	rogabit	rogarit
42	pingens <i>a</i> pingues La	grandes
iii. 84	nihilo	nihilum
93	rogabis	rogavit
95	hic	id
115	alget	alges
v. 68	hesternum	externum
75	veri	virii
84	libuit	voluit
93	tenvia	tenua
103	exclamet	exclamat
130	quid	quin
145	quod	quam
148	exhalet	exalet
171	aut	haut P haud R
175	quem	quam
vi. 6	iussisse	luisse
24	turdorum	turdarum
27	ast	at [vel ad ? P]
56	virbi	verbi
61	poscis	poscas
77	pavisse	plausisse

the Prologue between verses 8 and 9 a verse has been inserted in the lower margin, where we read: "corvos quis olim concavum salutare."

R is the earliest recorded manuscript in which this verse, which is found in some later manuscripts, has been interpolated.

A consideration of the variants found in the first hand in R shows that, for the most part, they represent  $\alpha\lambda$  readings. Examples are: i. 6 *examenque*; i. 44 *fas est*; i. 59 *imitata est*, where the reading in the text agrees with P. There are cases, however, where the  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha\lambda$  reading appears in the text, whereas that of P is given as the variant. These are: i. 9 *tunc*; i. 107 *verbo*; iii. 48 *summum*. An examination of erasures in i. 107 shows that originally the scribe wrote *vero* and added as a superscript *l'verbo*. He then erased *vero* and inserted *verbo* in its place, erased the superscript word and wrote *l'vero* in the margin. This would seem to indicate that when the manuscript from which he was copying offered variants, he felt free to choose which he should put into the text and which he should give as the variant.

An interesting connection with P is also to be found in vi. 9 where P has *pretium* (a gloss on *operae* from the scholium on that verse) instead of *portum*. R has both *pretium* and *portum* in the text. Evidently P's scribe took *pretium* as a substitute for *portum*, while the scribe of R thought that it was to be inserted.

In seeking to establish relationships between manuscripts, agreement in omissions is one of the most significant points. So it might seem that the omission of verse 46 of the first satire (which is added in the lower margin by the first hand) in R would lead to interesting conclusions, inasmuch as this same verse is omitted in Ramorino's Lr, where it is added in the lower margin in a later hand, and since it is placed after verse 47 in the text of  $\alpha$ , La, and Tr. The reason why this verse is omitted is obviously because it ends with the same word as verse 45. In the four manuscripts in which it occurs in the wrong place, the scribes apparently misunderstood the proper application of the insertion symbols. If there is any direct connection between La and Tr, indicated by this fact, we must assume that the original omission occurred in the common archetype of  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  and that the erroneous insertion was made in  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  themselves. But in that case how can we account for the fact that the verse was entirely omitted in Lr, which Ramorino identifies as a brother of La? This verse could hardly have been left out after it had once been inserted into the text in the wrong place. Its omission must have been caused by the fact

that it followed verse 45 (which also ends in the word *exil*) in the manuscript from which Lr or its parent was copied. If we consider that it was in  $\lambda$  that the omission occurred, that the verse was written in the margin of that manuscript later, was inserted in the wrong place in La and Tr., and was overlooked entirely by the scribe of Lr, then we must assume that the same error occurred independently in  $\alpha$  and that no connection is indicated. It seems easier, on the whole, to explain the matter thus. In the common archetype of  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$ , which we shall call  $\psi$ , the omitted verse was written in the margin with an insertion symbol so carelessly placed that it might refer either to verse 45 or to verse 47. The scribe of  $\alpha$  took it as referring to the latter, and inserted the verse at that point in the text. The writer of  $\lambda$ , uncertain as to the exact place indicated, copied the verse in the margin with the symbol exactly as he found it. The scribes of La and Tr. committed the same error as that of  $\alpha$ , while Lr overlooked the marginal insertion completely.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the verse was omitted in the text of R does not necessarily link that manuscript with the  $\alpha\lambda$  tradition, as a mistake of this kind is one of the easiest to account for paleographically. The same verse is also missing in a Valenciennes manuscript (Bib. Pub. 410) of the eleventh century,<sup>2</sup> which like R agrees more often with P than with  $\alpha$ .

Let us now glance at Reg. Lat. 1424. This manuscript is also written in Caroline minuscules of a later period than the other, probably of the early twelfth century. There are some characteristics of the script that suggest an earlier date, such as uniform occurrence of the 3-shaped *g*, and occasional use of the majuscule *N* within a sentence and even in the middle of a word.<sup>3</sup> The *NT* ligature as well as *NS* are found. The codex in its present form is composed of two manuscripts bound together. Persius occurs on folios 60–81v. of the first, which also contains the *Epistles* of Seneca and St. Paul, Cato's *Distichs*, *Liber de fonte vite* by Andradus Hinemarus, Avianus, Maximilianus, and Boethius' *De consolatione* i. On folio 90v. in a recent hand is written *celuici appartient a Monsieur Daniel*. There are three or four

<sup>1</sup> The Frisingensian florilegium (Mon. 6292), which agrees more often with  $\alpha$  than with P, also reverses the order of these verses (Wotke-Hosius, "Persiusexcerpte," *Rhein. Mus.*, XLIII [1888], 501).

<sup>2</sup> Reported by S. G. Owen in *Class. Quart.*, VI (1912), 21–34.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. fol. 61 v., Sat. i. 31, *Narrent* and fol. 68, Sat. iii. 45 *CatoNis*.

different hands distinguishable in this first manuscript. In Persius *ti* and *a* are almost impossible to tell apart.<sup>1</sup> The marginal and interlinear scholia are very full on folios 60v.-63, after which there are not any at all until folios 79-80 where there are a few. These were all put in by the first hand except for a few interlinear ones on folios 73 and 79v. which appear to be slightly later. There are scarcely any erasures or corrections in the text. A recent hand, perhaps the one that wrote Daniel's name on the last folio, has numbered the satires, added the *explicit* at the end of the *Vita* (fol. 80), and inserted superscript corrections in two places (fol. 73v., Sat. v. 61, *seri* and fol. 78, Sat. vi. 10, *destertuit*), without tampering with the text. An attempt to connect this manuscript with marginal readings ascribed to P. Daniel in a Foquelinian edition of Persius<sup>2</sup> as reported by Jahn<sup>3</sup> and Orelli<sup>4</sup> was unsuccessful. We note that another Persius manuscript (Bern Cod. No. 398) bears the name of F. Daniel. Since there is no initial in the Reginensis manuscript, we do not know whether it belonged to François or to Pierre, but, at any rate, there seems to be nothing in the Persius in his hand, except the two superscript words referred to above. A short *Vita* on folio 60 follows the *argumentum*, and a longer one occurs on folio 80 at the end of the satires (see collation appended to this article).

Let us now see to which tradition this manuscript (which we shall call "Reg.") belongs. Using as a basis the same passages on which we made our statistics for R, we discover that Reg. agrees with P in 42 cases (22 of which are right readings, 6 are erroneous, and the rest are places where either of two readings is possible); it supports La in 44 places, 35 of which show the right reading; and it agrees with *a* alone 6 times. Although it is evident from the foregoing report that in number of agreements Reg. does not support P so heavily as does R, still it clearly shows that it belongs to that side of the mixed tradition, and the following readings link it with P in a peculiar fashion. In i. 61 there is in the first hand the variant *ius*, which is found in P alone of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ramorino, *op. cit.*, p. 254, on the archetype of A and B where *araticemque* (v. 40) is due to the same sort of script. This very word might be read thus in a hasty glance at this manuscript.

<sup>2</sup> This is now in the Stadtsbibliothek in Bern, No. G. 37.

<sup>3</sup> 1843 edition, *Prolegomena*, p. ccxii.

<sup>4</sup> *Eclogae poetarum Latinorum* (Turici, 1833).

all the manuscripts discussed above, while in vi. 23 we find in the text the word *rhombos*, which occurs in all of the other manuscripts, except P, as *scombro*.<sup>1</sup> In Prol. 3 *prodierim* (the erroneous reading of P alone) is given as a variant, also in the first hand. We may note also that in Prol. 14 Reg., like R, follows P in reading *p Pegaseum*. A connection with P is also to be seen in the fact that Satire iv is joined to the preceding without a break.

In the first three satires we observe that the titles were put in with red ink. Satire iv, as we have said, was considered part of iii, and in Satires v and vi, while space was left, the titles were not put in. We note also that through folio 69 (Sat. iii. 79) the initial letters of each line were put in in red, but that thereafter ink of the same color as that of the text was used. The titles where they do occur, however, agree with those in the  $\alpha\lambda$  tradition, rather than with P. This variation in the form of the titles is one of the distinctive differences between the  $\alpha$  and P families. Unfortunately, R omits titles altogether, so that we cannot trace its relationship through this fact.

A survey of the whole situation makes it appear likely that in  $\psi$ , the common archetype of  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$ , the text first suffered drastic changes through the insertion of glosses for textual readings, and through deliberate emendation of passages which were difficult to understand. At this time too a new set of titles was introduced, which passed down through  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  to their descendants, A, B, La, Lr, etc.  $\chi$ , the ancestor of P and of its brother  $\pi$ , from which R is descended, did not suffer these changes, but  $\pi$  was later "corrected" from a manuscript of the  $\lambda$  group, and this accounts for the readings of the mixed tradition which appear in such manuscripts as R, Reg., and Val. in which the P text seems to have been the basis. We have then, on the one hand,  $\alpha$  with its brother  $\lambda$  in which some P readings still remain, because they were the original ones, and, on the other side, we have P with its brother  $\pi$  which has been contaminated by contact with  $\lambda$ . The following examples may serve to bring out this relationship more clearly. We assume that the manuscript as Persius wrote it contained the following readings in the places designated: Prol. 5 *remitto*; Prol. 14 *nectar*; v. 78 *turbinis*; vi. 46 *captis*. Its descendant,  $\phi$ , introduced the following glosses above each of these words:

<sup>1</sup> Leo, however, prints *rhombus* in his text.

*relinquo, melos, temporis, victis*. From  $\phi$  were transcribed  $\chi$  and  $\psi$ .  $\chi$  made a choice in each case and wrote *remitto, melos, turbinis, captis* (a wrong choice merely in the second word).  $\psi$ , however, copied the text as it was found, giving both words in each case. From  $\psi$  were descended  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$ .  $\alpha$  chose *remitto, nectar, temporis, victis* (two mistakes) while  $\lambda$  took *relinquo, melos, temporis, victis* (not one of which was in the text originally).  $\pi$ , a descendant of  $\chi$ , when "corrected" from  $\lambda$  or its parent, received into its text *relinquo, temporis, and victis*, which passed into R, Reg., and Val. This process of correction and recorection went on among the later manuscripts to such an extent that the texts have become deeply interwoven, but even in the descendants of the  $\alpha\lambda$  group we find that the P reading succeeds in trickling through. For example, we may consider Vat. Reg. Lat. 1560<sup>1</sup> whose kinship with A and B is distinctly seen in the erroneous readings *tecum* (vi. 59); *angue* (vi. 68); and *tuus hic* (vi. 71). This manuscript unmistakably belongs to the  $\alpha\lambda$  group and yet it presents agreement with P in the reading *captis* (vi. 46) instead of *victis* which is found in the other manuscripts of its family. Again, in the case of Tr. (Trèves no. 1089), which Ramorino has identified as belonging to the *recensio emendata*, the correct P reading *plausisse* (vi. 77) has succeeded in resisting change to the more popular *pavisse*. Also, in Lr and Tr. we find *elargiri* (iii. 71) as against *largiri* of the other  $\alpha\lambda$  descendants.

A study of the collations of R and Reg. as appended to this article brings out the fact that there are few very significant readings peculiar to either codex. We might mention in passing that R agrees with the Frisingensian *florilegium* in the erroneous reading *oberret* (iv. 26)<sup>2</sup> and that both R and Reg. agree with it in the correct *subposui* (v. 36), also found in the second hand in La. We observe further that R has *animi* (ii. 73), the reading found in the scholiast on Statius<sup>3</sup> and in some of the later manuscripts. For this as well as for the additional verse in the Prologue, R is the earliest authority that has so far been reported.

These collations, then, are of interest not so much for any new contributions that they may make to the text of the author as because they furnish evidence that there exists a class of manuscripts belong-

<sup>1</sup> Reported by Cerati in *Riv. di fil. class.*, XL (1912), 113.

<sup>2</sup> Wotke-Hosius, *op. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> *Theb.* ii. 247.



ing to the mixed tradition, which, unlike most of those which have hitherto been reported, inclines less to the  $\alpha$  branch than to the P side of the family, which we believe approximates more nearly the text as Persius wrote it.

These collations are based on Leo's (Berlin, 1910) edition of Persius. Differences in spelling have, for the most part, been omitted. The work of the original scribe is indicated as *m*.

## VAT. REG. LAT. 1562

Prol. 1 cavallino (*litt. v i. r.*) 3 memini me ut 4 et pallidam 5 relinquo 6 ipse ego semipaganus 8 chere *et i. m. d m<sup>2</sup> i. m. inf. h* corvos quis olim concavum salutare *m<sup>2</sup>* 9 picasque—nostra verba 10 ingenique 14 p pegaseum melos. Liber Persii

i. 4 polidamas 6 examenve *m i. m. l'que m<sup>1</sup>* 8 rome est quis 9 Tum *m i. m. l'tunc m<sup>1</sup>* 16 tand. nat. 17 legens 18 collueris mobile *m colluerit m<sup>2</sup>* 19 Hic—neque 20 Ingentes—tytus *m tytos m<sup>1</sup>* 22 alienas *m alienis m<sup>1</sup>* 24 *i. m. l'simul m<sup>1</sup>* 30 pendas—querunt 31 pemata *m poemata m<sup>1</sup>* 32 *i. m. l'tunc m<sup>1</sup>*—cui *om. m. sscr. m<sup>1</sup>* 37 imprimis *m imprimit m<sup>1</sup>* 38 e manibus *m emanibus m<sup>2</sup>* 39 *i. m. l'et m<sup>1</sup>* 43 nectbus 44 *i. m. l'fas est m<sup>1</sup>* 46 *vs. om. m i. m. dd m<sup>1</sup> i. m. inf. hh et vs. add. m<sup>1</sup>* 51 voratro *m sscr. l've m<sup>1</sup>* 57 sesquipo de extat 59 imitari *m sscr. l' ta ē m<sup>1</sup>* 60 tantum 65 victura *m vinctura m<sup>1</sup>* l'iunctura *sscr. m<sup>1</sup>* 66 dirigat 69 videmus 70 lucos 72 pallilia *m palilia m<sup>2</sup>*—foeno 73 dentalia *m dentilia m<sup>2</sup>* 74 dictatura 77 pacu uus—que *om. m sscr. m<sup>1</sup>* 81 duae *litt. ante dedecus erasae sunt, fortasse ve—in om. m sscr. m<sup>1</sup>* 86 inantithetis *i. corr.; erat inanis ?* 87 bellum hoc bellum hoc—ceves *m sscr. l'vis m<sup>1</sup>* 88 moneat *m moveat m<sup>2</sup>* 92 vinctura 93 didicet verum 94 derimebat—delphi 97 pregrandi 99 mammo *m mamalnis statim corr. m<sup>1</sup>* mamalloneis *m<sup>1</sup>* mimalloneis *m<sup>2</sup>* 106 bluteum—ungues 107 vero *m sscr. l'verbo m<sup>1</sup> postea vero in verbo corr., var. lect. erasit, et l'vero i. m. d. add.* 109 canica *m canina m<sup>1</sup>* 111 et enim—mire *m sscr. l'a m<sup>1</sup>* 112 facit *m sscr. l'faxat m<sup>1</sup>* 113 angues—lucus *m sscr. l'locus m<sup>1</sup>* 114 lucinius *m sscr. lius m<sup>1</sup>* 115 genuivum *m genuinum m<sup>1</sup>* 119 scrope *m scrobe m<sup>2</sup>* 120 vidirem *m vidi m<sup>1</sup>* 126 Unde *m Inde m<sup>1</sup>* 127 incredas *m sscr. l'increpidus m<sup>1</sup>* 129 sese 132 ririsce 133 sicinio *m sicinico m<sup>1</sup>* 134 calli-  
rendo *m calli-roen do m<sup>1</sup>*

ii. 1 macrinae 2 labentes—apponet 3 poss *m poscis statim corr. m<sup>1</sup>* 5 libavit 6 cuius *m cuius m<sup>1</sup>* 8 ut et—audeat 9 sub *om. m sscr. m<sup>1</sup>* 10 ebullit patri 13 expugnam 17 minime *m minimum m<sup>1</sup>* 19 stagio 23 acce *m acse se m<sup>1</sup>* 31 aut *om.* 34 urentes 35 Tunc *m Tinc m<sup>1</sup>*—macram spem 36 lucini *m licini m<sup>1</sup>* 37 optet 38 quicquid calcaverat 41 poscit 44 restruere *m rem struere m<sup>1</sup>* 45 pannates *m penates m<sup>2</sup>* 46 foetum 47 flammas 48 At—ferro *m ferto m<sup>1</sup>* 52 incusaque *m incussa-que m<sup>2</sup>* 54

excultas 63 diis 70 a om. 72 animi [sic] om. m sscr. m<sup>1</sup> 75 admoveam m admovear m<sup>2</sup>

iii. 1 N i. corr.; erat N—hic m hęc m<sup>1</sup> 7 itane 9 dicas 10 bic. pos. 12 queritur 13 set] quod—vanescat 14 queritur 16 at—balumbo 18 possis m poscis m<sup>2</sup> 20 ludit m luditur m<sup>2</sup>—effluit m effluit m<sup>2</sup> 21 percussa 29 censoremque 33 ping<sup>u</sup>aret m pingucaret m<sup>2</sup>—quod 39 atra m <sup>a</sup>atra m<sup>1</sup>

<sup>u</sup>atra m<sup>2</sup> 42 quod 44 mem? m memini m<sup>2</sup> 46 et ab insano—laudando—ministro m magistro m<sup>1</sup> 48 summo m sscr. l'um m<sup>1</sup>—quod 56 deduxit m diduxit m<sup>1</sup> 58 sertis m stertis m<sup>1</sup> 59 externum 60 quo—dirigis 64 poscentes 65 cratero m crato m<sup>1</sup> sscr. tero m<sup>2</sup> eras. m<sup>1</sup> 66 d. o. miseri et c. 68 quam 69 motus m modus m<sup>2</sup>—quod asper 71 largiri 73 neque 75 clientis 78 quod sat. est sap. m. 79 salones 84 Denichilo nichil innichilum nil 86 populus m populus m<sup>1</sup>—multum torosaque 87 cacinno m cacinnos m<sup>2</sup> 88 quid pidat m quid trepidat m<sup>2</sup> 89 facibus m faucibus m<sup>2</sup> 90 quid m

qui m<sup>1</sup> 93 loturo m <sup>u</sup>laturo m<sup>2</sup>—surgentina m sscr. l'surgentia m<sup>1</sup> 104 amonis m sscr. l'i m<sup>1</sup> 105 rigidus 107 Tange ?????(erat miser?) miser m Tange <sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup>venas miser m<sup>2</sup>—pectora 108 summos pedes 109 friget m frigent m<sup>1</sup> 114 putre m l'es sscr. m<sup>1</sup> 115 alge m alges m<sup>2</sup>—aristis m aristas m<sup>1</sup> 116 fervescat 118 est

iv. 3 hoc] o 5 tacendaque 9 puto—istud 10 scit m scis m<sup>1</sup>—lance 17 summi m summa statim corr. m<sup>1</sup> 19 in hunc m sscr. l'nunc m<sup>1</sup> i, nunc m<sup>2</sup> et sscr. imp. m<sup>1</sup> 21 nederius m nedeterius m<sup>1</sup> 22 ozima 25 vectidis m vectidi m<sup>1</sup> 26 millvis m milluus m<sup>2</sup>—oberret 27 diis 29 veteris 30 mordem m mordens m<sup>1</sup> 31 farratam—ollam 33 fricas 35 in i. corr.; erat hi (?) 36 ructantem (uct i. corr. m<sup>2</sup>) m sscr. l'runcantem m<sup>1</sup> i. m. melius m<sup>1</sup>—marcentes 37 Tum cum 38 inguibus m inguinibus m<sup>1</sup> 39 plantalia m plantaria m<sup>1</sup> 40

labefactant 41 filix—ulli m ullo m<sup>2</sup> 44 alto m <sup>u</sup>alto m<sup>1</sup> auro sscr. m<sup>1</sup> 50 ne quicquam 52 ut noris—tibi om. m sscr. sit tibi m<sup>1</sup> eras. m<sup>1</sup>

v. 2 optari 6 nui m sscr. l'niti m<sup>1</sup> 13 stloppo 14 agri m acri m<sup>1</sup> 15 teris —pallentes 16 ingenio m ingenuo m<sup>2</sup> 17 dices (es i. ras.; erat as?) 19 studio 21 secreti 25 piete tectoria m sscr. fiete plec m<sup>2</sup> 26 His—voces 28 hoc m

sscr. l'hec m<sup>1</sup> 32 domites m comites m<sup>1</sup>—subuna m subuna m<sup>1</sup> 37 tum 40 vultum m sscr. l'vulvum m<sup>1</sup> 46 ab uno i corr. m<sup>2</sup> 50 iovi 51 quid certe 56 fatur m satur m<sup>1</sup> 58 putris et—cyragra 59 Fregerit 61 vitam relictam 63 inserit m inseris m<sup>1</sup> 64 cleatea—iuvenesque senesque 66 quod 68 externum 70 se m te sscr. m<sup>2</sup> 71 cantum 73 quique m quisque m<sup>2</sup> 76 tres si sagosa m sagoso m<sup>1</sup> 78 temporis 81 assignam m assigna m<sup>1</sup> 84 voluit 87 Hęc reliqua 90 excepit m excepto m<sup>1</sup>—vetabit 93 erit—tenua 96 garrit m gannit m<sup>2</sup> 97 id om.—vetavit m sscr. vitiavit m<sup>2</sup> 99 vetidos m vetitos <sup>i</sup>—insicia 102 pero nactus m pero natus m<sup>1</sup> 103 exclamat 104 fronte m

frontem  $m^2$  105 veri specim̄ [=specimen] 106 tinneat 107 et quē vitanda  
 109 p̄sulare  $m$  p̄ssolare  $m^2$  112 Iamque gluto 114 at 116 pellicam  $m$   
 pelliculam  $m^1$  117 sub—vulpem 118 Quē sup. ded.—finemque  $m$  funemque  
 $m^1$  123 satiri 124 sumis *i. corr.*  $m^2$ ; erat sentis ? 127 increpuit  $m$  increpui  
 $m^1$  128 ne quiquam  $m$  ne quicquam  $m^2$  130 quin 131 q. astrigiles  $m$  q.  
 strigiles  $m^1$  134 rogatas ensa perdam  $m$  perdas  $m^2$  136 et 138 Varo 142  
 nisi 143 moveat 145 I<sup>nt</sup>umuit erat Ibi—extinguerit 146 tun—ubi  $m$   
 tibi  $m^2$  147 caena—vegetanumque 150 peragunt—sudore  $m$  sudare  $m^2$   
 152 et fabula et manes 153 hoc *om.* 155 hunc cine 157 cum tu 159 et  
*om.*—abripit  $m$  arripit  $m^2$ —et 161 dolores  $m$  labores  $m^2$  162 unguem cher.  
 164 an (*vel ad ?*) rem  $m$  a rem  $m^1$  165 ad scēnum frangem  $m$  frangam  $m^1$   
 167 diis pellentibus 168 censem  $m$  censem  $m^1$  171 Nec 172 accersor 174  
 nunc n̄  $m$  <sup>e</sup>nunc n̄  $m^1$  <sup>ne</sup>nunc n̄  $m^2$ —quem 177 crttata  $m$  cretata  $m^2$  179  
 pulchri is  $m$  pulchrius  $m^1$  180 venere unctas diesque fenestras  $m$  uncta d.  
 fenestra  $m^2$  183 nata thinni  $m$  natat thinni  $m^2$  185 rupta  $m$  rupto  $m^1$  186  
 lisca  $m$  lusca  $m^1$  190 fulfennius

vi. 1 ras. *inter verb. prim. et sec.*; erat & ? 3 rerum *i. corr.*  $m^2$ ; erat vocum  
 6 egregios  $m$  egregius  $m^2$  7 intebet 8 lituisse  $m$  litus se  $m^2$  9 portum est  
 pretium opere cognoscite  $m$  cognoscere  $m^2$ —o cives 22 grandia  $m$  grandi  $m^1$   
 23 scombros 24 tenuem—saluas  $m$  saluiam  $m^1$  26 emule  $m$  emules  $m^2$ —  
 metuis 29 ioio  $m$  ionio  $m^1$  31 iacere  $m$  lacere  $m^2$  35 spiret  $m$  spirent  $m^2$   
 37 colomis—urget 39 hoc nostrum 41 Hec  $m$  Nec  $m^2$ —metues  $m$  metuas  
 $m^1$  42 seduecior 46 clamides—victis  $m$  captis  $m^2$  48 Diis 49 inducit  $m$   
 inducit  $m^1$  induco  $m^2$  50 Ve nesi conives 51 audeo 55 bovillas  $m$  sscr.  
 l'n  $m^1$  56 ūbi [=verbi]  $m$  ubi  $m^2$ —manius  $m$  mannius  $m^1$  58 pmpte (*quatt.*  
*ult. litt. i. corr.*  $m^2$ ) 60 manius  $m$  mannius  $m^2$  61 inde cursu—poscas 63  
 rennius—vintu 64 De est—mi??? (*erat minui ?*)  $m$  minimum  $m^2$  66 legarat  
 $m$  legerat  $m^2$  tad?us  $m$  taciuis  $m^2$ —nedicta  $m$  nedicta  $m^1$  67 foenoris 68  
 reliquum (*bis*) 70 sinciput  $m$  sinciput  $m^1$  71 satur (*tres ult. litt. i. corr.*;  
*erat satis ?*)—anseris 72 singulte  $m$  singulti  $m^1$  73 inmeiat (*tot. verb. praelet*  
*duas prim. litt. i. corr.*; *non erat inmelat, ut videtur*) 75 sollens 76 nec 77  
 Cappa docas—pingues 78 nam 79 depingue—Finis.

## VAT. REG. LAT. 1424

Prol. 3 memini me ut—prodirem  $m$  sscr. l'prodierim  $m^1$  5 relinquo 8  
 chere al XHPH *sic i. t.* 9 picasque—nostra verba 12 fulgeat 14 p pega-  
 seum melos

i. Rub. Incipit Aulis Persii Flaci Satira Prim. *i. m. Sat. 1 m. rec.* 2 agis  
 $m$  ais  $m^1$  6 examenve 17 legens 18 colluerit 19 Hic 20 Ingentes 30  
 pendas 33 loquutus 36 nunc nunc  $m$  non  $m^2$  42 loquutus 44 fas est 59

imitata est 61 fas *m. i. m.* l'ius *m*<sup>1</sup> 62 posticie 64 Hunc 67 et prandia 68  
grans *m* grandes *statim corr. m*<sup>1</sup> 69 videmus 74 dictaturam 78 lutificabile  
82 exultat 84 obtes 87 bellum hoc bellum hoc 89 frat *m* fracta te *statim*  
*corr. m*<sup>1</sup> 93 did. vers. 94 delfin 97 pregrandi 100 ut raptumque cap. vit.  
101 licem *m* lincem *m*<sup>1</sup> 106 unguet 109 carina 111 omnes etenim 112 in  
qui 113 angues 119 mem mutire 133 sicinico

ii. *Rub. Lib. II. ad Plotiū Maē De Ontate (litt. t prior corr. ex litt. s) Vi.*  
*i. m. Sat. 2 m. rec.* 6 cuius 10 ebullit patrui 19 stagio 22 stagio—bene  
—clamat 23 clamat 35 spe macra 36 Hunc 37 obtent 40 quam iuste  
45 arcessis—penates 46 foetum 47 flamma 48 At 50 expes 53 Puro—  
sudesi et 54 excuties—pretrepidum 63 dis *m* diis *m*<sup>1</sup> 65 Haec 66 Nec  
72 messare *m* messale *m*<sup>1</sup>

iii. *Rub. Alloquitur Desidiosos i. m. Sat. 3 m. rec.* 2 ostendit 3 dis  
pumare 9 Fitidor—dicas 12 queritur—cal. crass. 13 n. quod inf. 14  
queritur 19 In 29 censuremque 32 tibus *m* fibris *m*<sup>1</sup> 33 quod 34 rursum  
48 quod 51 Nec 56 deduxit 60 quo dirigit 61 In 66 O miseri et 68  
quam 75 clientis 76 Venaque 78 satis est sapio 80 luminet 84 nichilo  
nichil in nichilum nil 105 Importa

iv. (*Sat. iv tertiae adiungitur*) *i. m. Sat. 4 m. rec.* 5 tacendaque 9 puto—  
istud 13 est 17 soni *m* boni *m*<sup>1</sup> 21 pannucea 22 ozima 23 Et 27 diis  
28 competa 31 farratam—ollam 35 in 36 rumcantem—marcentes 41  
flex 42 prebimus 48 poenem 49 caut. mult.

v. (*Sat. v sine tit. sed sp. relict.*) *i. m. Sat. 5 m. rec.* 1 linguas 2 carmine  
13 Hec stloppo 15 teris 21 secreti 33 iam iamdidus 35 deducit 47  
equalis 55 cymini 58 cyragra 61 Et sibi iam sibi *m* sscr. seri *m. rec.*—  
vitam—relictam 64 pueris *m* puerique *statim corr. m*<sup>1</sup> 78 temporis 87  
Haec reliqua 95 sabucam 97 id *om.* 103 exclamat 105 veri specimen  
107 et que vitanda 111 nil *m* nummum *m*<sup>1</sup> 112 gluto 116 retinens 117  
sub 121 *post hunc versum apparet verbum rebus quod deest versui* 124 *cum*  
*nullum spatium sit in loco proprio.* 123 satiri 124 summis 130 quin 131  
adtrigiles 136 et 140 puer. is 141 obstet 147 vegentanumque 150  
sudare 151 lēci 159 ast 163 adrodens hoc an siccis ait d. ob. 167 diis  
dep. 170 adque 172 accessor 175 quem 190 fulfennius

vi (*Sat. vi sine tit. sed sp. relict.*) *i. m. Sat. 6 m. rec.* 6 senes 10 dest??tuit  
*m* sscr. destertuit *m. rec.* 17 laguena 23 Hec 24 tenuem—salivam 37  
urget 41 Heccine re 46 victis 50 veni si conives 51 audeo 55 novillas  
56 mannus 60 Mannius 61 poscas 64 deest 66 stadius—reponē 68  
reliquum [bis]—unge 69 Unge—coquetur 76 nec 77 pavisce 79 depinge.  
Explicit intortus p totum Persius orbem.

#### VITA [REG. 1424]<sup>1</sup>

1 nonarum—decembres—octavo kalendarum decembris—rubrio—asinio  
2 natus est 3 pater eius 4 remium—palemonem—annei 5 cessium—

<sup>1</sup> Collated with that in Leo's ed., pp. 64–66.

straturam—numanum—etiam *ante* anneum *om.*—etiam *ante* lucanum *add.*—  
 phylosophye—adeo mirab.—retineret se recitantem clamore—quin illa esse  
 vera poetica diceret—sed non eius cap. ing.—tunc *om.*—phylophantium—  
 agaturini—lacedemonii pet. aristote gratis magnetis—equales—minores.  
 Ipse—summe dilectus est apud traseam ita ut, etc.—arriani 6 fame pulcre—  
 fuit frui pud. 7 tantum—codicellis—sestercias—pondera viginti—chrysippi  
*om.*—a cornuto sub lib.—fr. hered. 8 scriptitavit . . . reliquit *om.*—  
 deptis ultimi ibi ut quasi, etc.—recitavit corn.—cessio—etiam flaccus—  
 pretexta—paucos sororum thrasie in arriani matrem versus que ante virum  
 occiderat—omnia autem auctor—aborreret 10 sed mox, etc. *adiungitur*  
*praecedenti*—ascola et mag.—diverterat—libro lucilli—detractis mox omnibus  
 —ut et etiam—illius temporis principem culpaverit—haberent—ipse est  
 emend.—de se—Explicit vita Persii per cornutum *m. rec.*

WELLS COLLEGE  
 AURORA, N. Y.

## THE CLEITOPHON OF PLATO

By G. M. A. GRUBE

THE *Cleitophon* is the shortest dialogue in the Platonic corpus. Though it was considered genuine by the unanimous tradition of antiquity,<sup>1</sup> it was printed as spurious in the Aldine edition, a mistake for which the editors apologized, but the little work has never recovered from the insult. It was declared spurious by most of the great scholars of the nineteenth century, and has since been unduly neglected.<sup>2</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to show that that fate is undeserved. The argument is as follows:

Someone, says Socrates, has told me that Cleitophon disapproves of my teaching and prefers that of Thrasymachus. Cleitophon protests that it is only certain aspects of the Socratic teaching of which he disapproves, and when urged to explain, he does so in a set speech which takes up the rest of the dialogue. He says in effect: "I fully approve of exhorting people to care above all things for virtue and the good of their soul, and you, Socrates, are admittedly unsurpassed at converting people to this point of view. But when the convert asks your followers what virtue is, and how one is to set about attaining it, they cannot give a satisfactory answer; they say that virtue leads to what is useful, necessary, advantageous, or profitable, but when pressed fail to establish for this science of virtue of which they speak any achievement distinct from that of other sciences. Nor, indeed, can you do so yourself: at one time you say that virtue consists in harming one's enemies and benefiting one's friends, at another time it appears that the virtuous man will not harm anyone. And it is ever so: either you do not know what virtue is, and can only sing its praises, as one might sing the praises of the pilot's craft without being a pilot, or else you

<sup>1</sup> See Diogenes Laertius iii. 60 and 62; Proclus *In Timaeum* i. 7b; Hippolytus (Diels, *Doxographi*, p. 569, l. 26) *Philosoph.* 19, 21, where he quotes 407d as part of the *Republic*; and Grote's *Plato*, I, 268 and 292.

<sup>2</sup> It is rejected by Ast, *Platons Leben und Schriften* (1816), p. 500; Schleiermacher, *Introd. and notes to translation* (1861); W. A. Heidel, *Pseudo-Platonica* (Chicago dissertation, 1896). It is ignored by Jowett and Apelt in their translations of Plato. See also O. Apelt, *Platonische Aufsätze* (1912), pp. 114 ff. The main supporter of genuineness, apart, of course, from Grote, is Yxem, *Ueber Platons Kleitophon* (1846).

will not tell. That is why I turn in despair to Thrasymachus or anyone else who promises to help me, realizing that, though Socrates is without equal at obtaining conversion, once this is done, he is more of a hindrance than a help."

The authorship of this little work raises several interesting questions: Can such an attack upon Socrates have been written by Plato? How far is it answerable? What is the reason of it? Where can a place be found for it among Plato's works? Are the language and style Platonic?

It has been thought<sup>1</sup> that Plato would never have attacked Socrates in this manner. But the *Parmenides* alone should be a sufficient proof that he was capable of it; indeed, it is characteristic of Plato to put the other side of a question so ably that it seems unanswerable until he answers it. Ptolemaeus<sup>2</sup> was far from the mark when he suggested that Cleitophon's tirade did not deserve an answer, but, on the other hand, I do not agree with Grote<sup>3</sup> that the case is so well put that Plato himself could not have finished the *Cleitophon*. We might see through Callicles and Polus in the *Gorgias* without Socrates' help, but let us imagine that the *Republic* broke off after the speeches of Glaucon and Adeimantus in the second book, or the *Theaetetus* after Protagoras' imagined defense, would they too not have seemed unanswerable? Yet I suggest that against the Socrates of early dialogues such as the *Gorgias*, the *Laches*, etc., the charge is deserved. In the later books of the *Republic*, on the other hand, Socrates does give practical guidance; the development of the theory of ideas, the whole scheme of education, would give Cleitophon exactly the kind of help he is asking for, and the *Theaetetus* would also have taught him that he must ultimately rely on himself, that intellectual midwifery is all he may reasonably expect from Socrates. So that, whoever the author, Cleitophon's objections are nothing short of ludicrous if formulated after the appearance of the whole *Republic* and later works. To suggest, as Wilamowitz does,<sup>4</sup> that the *Cleitophon* is a bad answer to the *Republic*, written by a pupil who had not taken the trouble to read through that work, is surely highly fanciful; such a pupil would have been a laughing-stock in that very distinguished school, and I fail to see how his handi-

<sup>1</sup> By Schleiermacher, *loc. cit.*, and Heidel, *loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Quoted by Proclus *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> III, 421.

<sup>4</sup> *Platon*, I, 490, n. 5.



work could have come to be included among the works of the master. Besides, the author was someone capable of constructive thought, as well as intelligent criticism, as is proved by his clear distinction between the *ἔργον* and the *δίδαγμα* of a science.<sup>1</sup> We are thus led to a first conclusion, that the *Cleitophon* cannot have been written later than the bulk of the *Republic*.

Granted, then, that Plato was capable of this criticism of Socrates, why should he have done so? No one will deny that Plato in his earliest works concentrated on *πρωτρεπτικοὶ λόγοι* such as *Cleitophon* refers to, or that, at a later period, he became more positive in his teaching. We must then suppose that a time came when he was not satisfied with his earlier method.<sup>2</sup> I suggest that this dissatisfaction is expressed in the *Cleitophon*, and that Plato is here just as much in earnest in his criticism of his earlier Socrates as he is in the *Parmenides*, when, at the close of the middle period of his writings, he criticizes the theory of ideas as thus far expressed by himself. Neither criticism was completely answerable, both are answered in part in the dialogues that follow them. If this is so, it may well be that the *Cleitophon* is not a fragment at all. Plato was not afraid to criticize himself, even when he had no answer ready. Whether it be a fragment, a preliminary sketch, or a complete work, our dialogue may be genuine in any case, though the abrupt Introduction and lack of polish in one or two places would seem to indicate that it lacks final revision. Grote aptly reminds us that "the great works of Plato could not have been completed without preliminary sketches and tentatives."<sup>3</sup> Even if the *Cleitophon* was one of these, it was well worth preserving.

But apart from any general relation the *Cleitophon* bears to the dialogues as a whole, it has an especially close connection with the first book of the *Republic*.

## CLEITOPHON

406a: Cleitophon has complained of Socrates to Lysias and praised Thrasymachus.

## REPUBLIC I

Lysias, Cleitophon, and Thrasymachus are among those whom Socrates finds at the house of Cephalus [328b].

<sup>1</sup> *Cleitophon* 409b.

<sup>2</sup> The frequent allusions to traits of Socrates as described by Plato make it clear that it is Socrates as we know him in Plato who is being attacked. Whether or not this is the historical Socrates does not concern us here.

<sup>3</sup> III, 421.

## CLEITOPHON

409c: Every τέχνη has its ἔργον as well as its theory or διδασκαλία.

409d: What is the ἔργον of δικαιοσύνη?

409c: οὗτος μὲν, ὡς οἶμαι, τὸ σύμφορον ἀπεκρίνατο, ἄλλος δὲ τὸ δέον, ἕτερος δὲ τὸ ὠφέλιμον, ὃ δὲ τὸ λυσιτελοῦν.

410b-c: καὶ εἶπες μοι δικαιοσύνης εἶναι τοὺς μὲν ἔχθρους βλάπτειν, τοὺς δὲ φίλους εὖ ποιεῖν, ὕστερον δὲ ἐφάνη βλάπτειν γε οὐδέποτε ὃ δίκαιος οὐδένα.

## REPUBLIC I

In the course of the discussion Cleitophon tries to support Thrasymachus [340b].

355d: What is the ἔργον of δικαιοσύνη?

342a: Every τέχνη seeks the advantage of its object, not its own.

336d: Thrasymachus says: καὶ ὅπως μοι μὴ ἔρεῖς ὅτι τὸ δέον ἐστὶ μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ ὠφέλιμον μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ λυσιτελοῦν μὴδ' ὅτι τὸ σύμφορον.

332d: τὸ τοὺς φίλους ἄρα εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἔχθρους κακῶς.

335d: οὐκ ἄρα τοῦ δικαίου βλάπτειν ἔργον, ὃ πολέμαρχε, οὔτε φίλον οὔτ' ἄλλον οὐδένα.

Further, the first book of the *Republic*, at least after Thrasymachus' equation of justice with the advantage of the strongest is proved incorrect, may well be called a προτρεπτικός λόγος. The ancients had therefore every reason to place the *Cleitophon* near the first book of the *Republic*. Grote considers that the *Republic* is an answer to the *Cleitophon*. Absolute certainty in such matters is impossible, but I am convinced that our author had *Republic* i before him.<sup>1</sup> We have seen that it cannot have been written after the later books, and this forces us to conclude that the most probable time for the *Cleitophon* to have been written is after the first, but before the other books of the *Republic*, for the second book also begins with a spirited criticism of Socrates. Now if the *Cleitophon* is spurious we have to suppose that the first book of the *Republic* was published separately, and further that some bright pupil then criticized his master, who was so impressed as to mend his ways forever after.<sup>2</sup> Is it not far more likely that Plato wrote the criticism himself? The speeches of Glaucon and Adeimantus take

<sup>1</sup> So Taylor, *Plato: The Man and His Work*, p. 12: "Yet there is the difficulty that the little work appears on the face of it to be in form a criticism of the parts played by Socrates and Thrasymachus in *Republic* i, and it is hard to think of Plato as thus playing the critic to one of his own writings." Taylor seems inclined to consider the *Cleitophon* genuine.

<sup>2</sup> This is more probable than the dull pupil of Wilamowitz. But such a supposition is quite gratuitous. Such "pupils" have also been made to account for the *Hippias Major* (for references see my "Language and Logic of the *Hippias Major*," *Class. Phil.*, October, 1929, and for the *Theages* see Jannell in *Hermes*, Vol. XXXVI).

the matter up from a different angle, but their main point is also that Socrates must tell them the nature of justice itself, and that of its effects.<sup>1</sup> Cleitophon belongs to the same school of thought. I suggest that when Plato had finished *Republic* i, which, whether published separately or not, is complete in itself, he felt the need for criticism of his work in general and that book in particular. The *Cleitophon* is a first expression of such criticism. It is embodied and developed in the speeches of Glaucon and Adeimantus at the beginning of Book ii. The rest of the *Republic* is, in part, the answer.

If then, as I have attempted to show, the content of the *Cleitophon* is Platonic, and we can find a suitable place for it in the Platonic corpus, the presumption in favor of authenticity is strong, and only definite evidence of un-Platonic language and style should make us reject it from the list of Plato's genuine works. But no evidence that is at all conclusive has been brought against either style or vocabulary. It is true that the Introduction is abrupt, but this is also the case with the *Meno*, and Plato varied his manner considerably in such matters. It is said that Socrates was not the man to be upset by criticism; this is true, but if the first sentence is spoken with a smile,<sup>2</sup> it is very natural, for although Socrates would not mind much what a Thrasy-machus, a Callicles, or a Hippias said about him, he would certainly want to understand the criticisms brought against him by a friend and fellow-student, as I take Cleitophon to have been. For the reference by Socrates to Cleitophon and himself in the third person many parallels can be found elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> Nor need we be surprised if Cleitophon speaks of "your ἡλικιωταί or συνεπιθυμηταί or whatever you call them," for we know that, though Socrates had many followers, he would object, in Plato at least, to their being looked upon as his pupils or disciples.<sup>4</sup>

A number of passages can be paralleled from other works,<sup>5</sup> but in no

<sup>1</sup> E.g., *Rep.* ii. 367c: μή οὖν ἡμῖν ἐνδείξῃ μόνον τῷ λόγῳ ὅτι δικαιοσύνη ἀδικίας κρείττων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τί ποιοῦσα ἐκάτερα τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτὴ δι' αὐτὴν. . . .

<sup>2</sup> So Yxem, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., *Phaedrus* 228b; *Meno* 70d; *Gorgias* 495d; *Euthyphro* 5a.

<sup>4</sup> See *Theaet* 150b ff.; *Apology* 20a-c, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Heidel makes much of the fact that the author of the *Cleitophon* "makes use" of certain spurious works, and in this connection he compares *Cleit.* 407c and e, 409d-410a

single case is the similarity of wording so strong as to indicate copying, and the *Cleitophon* is always clear by itself.

Against the vocabulary the case is also very weak. Objection is brought against the word *ἐξασκεῖν*, for example, which is apparently not used elsewhere in Plato; but on investigation it will be found that Plato was fond of compound verbs with *ἐξ*, where the preposition is mostly emphatic only. Ast gives forty-nine such compounds used only once in the undoubtedly genuine works, and twenty-five others used twice in all the works. In the expression *μελετητόν τε καὶ ἀσκητόν*, *μελετητόν* is not found elsewhere, but it is a perfectly regular formation, and *ἀσκητόν* itself is only used here and in the *Meno*. Of the dozen or so words<sup>1</sup> to which exception has been taken (not a great number) there are only two for which I can find no parallel. One is the word *δίδαγμα* in the sense of the theory of an art, but the distinction between theory and practice in science does not seem to be made in quite this manner anywhere else; the other is the expression *μακρότερον οὐδέν*, meaning "nothing further," which does not seem unnatural. In any case that is not sufficient to doubt the authorship when we know how varied and rich is Plato's vocabulary, and how frequently he uses words once and once only.

To sum up: The *Cleitophon* expresses a criticism of Socrates as he appears in the early dialogues of Plato which is not undeserved, and expresses a dissatisfaction which, in the nature of things, Plato himself

with *Alcib.* i. 108a, 130a, and 126a-127d, respectively; *Cleit.* 408a with *Theages* 126b; *Cleit.* 408a-b with *Erast.* 137d-e. But in no case is the similarity more than one of thought, and the thoughts are commonplaces.

<sup>1</sup> The fullest list is that of Heidel in *op. cit.*, where the following words also occur: *κατὰ κράτος* (407a), but see *Laws* iii. 692d. Liddell and Scott also quote Thuc. i. 63 for this use, "with all one's might," but the sense seems doubtful there; *ἐκούσιον* (407d) is said to be used in a forced rhetorical application, but it is surely no more so than in *Laws* ix. 861b, or *Polit.* 276e; *συνέβαινεν αὐτῷ* (409d) seems natural as Cleitophon is giving the conclusion of an argument which it is not the place to repeat; *καταμελετῆσαι* (410b) is wrongly translated as "to study carefully," the point being that, without being a pilot, a man might "make it his business" to sing the praises of the pilot's craft. Hence it means "to practice" and is the emphatic form of the usual *τέχνην μελετᾶν* (as in *Gorg.* 511b, etc.); cf. *Philebus* 56e.

*δίωμι* (410c) frequently retains its emphatic meaning as here. See *Phaedr.* 244a; *Phaedo* 100c; *Prot.* 353e.

In *πρὸς σε φαύλως ἔχειν* (406) *φαύλως* means "unworthily," as it usually does, and for the construction cf. *Apol.* 34c, *τάχ' ἂν . . . τις . . . αὐθαδέστερον πρὸς μὲ σχολή*, where, incidentally, the adverb also occurs nowhere else with this construction.

must at one time have felt. That Plato was capable of such self-criticism is proved in the *Parmenides* and elsewhere, and he would seem to make a real effort to meet it in his later works. The direct references to the first book of the *Republic* make it probable that it was written shortly after this, while it must have been written before the bulk of the later books. There is nothing un-Platonic about the language and style that could not be accounted for by lack of revision. It is therefore highly probable that the *Cleitophon* was written by Plato shortly before the second book of the *Republic*. If so it stands in the same relation to Plato's early work as the *Parmenides* to that of the middle period. That it fits in very well there is proved by the fact that if students are introduced to it when they have read early dialogues only, they enjoy it hugely and it seems to them to express exactly what they feel.

TRINITY COLLEGE  
TORONTO

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### STRATEGOI IN THE SAMIAN WAR (WITH AN UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTION)

#### I

Among the unpublished fifth-century fragments in the Epigraphic Museum at Athens I found one (EM 5408) which I soon recognized as a list of strategoi. It was not until after some months that I saw (or rather Professor A. B. West told me) that it was fragment *d* of *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 50 (Pactum cum Samiis, ca. 440/39),<sup>1</sup> of which Hiller says "*d* non vidi," and consequently it has remained unpublished. For though Wilhelm identified it many years ago, he has never published his composition of the document, though he has hinted at it in *Ath. Mitt.*, XXIII (1898), 472, where he says that the document "enthält nach einem Verzeichnisse der Strategen, die den Vertrag abzuschliessen und zu beschwören hatten, die Worte βαλλὲ ἔρχε, etc."

This was thirty-three years ago. It is high time a document of such importance was published complete. By the kindness of Dr. Klaffenbach, who put the material collected for *IG*, Volume I<sup>2</sup>, at my disposal, I was able to compare my squeeze of this fragment with squeezes of the three fragments already published. The likeness, at least to fragment *a*, is quite conclusive. Of fragments *b* and *c* I speak later.

The new fragment is in excellent condition, with part of its left-hand margin preserved. I read (strictly *stichedon*):

	.	.	ρ	α	τ	ε	γ
χ	θ	έ	ι	δ	ο	σ	:δ ε μ
ν	δ	ι	ο	ν	ι	δ	ο σ:χ
ε	σ	:γ	λ	α	υ	κ	ο ν α
5		ρ	ε	ι	δ	ο	σ:χ ρ ε

Here is evidently a catalogue involving the genitives of the ten Attic tribes: [Ερε]χθιδος—[Αιγιδος—Πα]νδιονιδος, etc. The first line, moreover, contains some part (or derivative) of the word στρατηγος, so that we appear to have a catalogue of strategoi by tribes. The name of the strategos stands before, not after, his tribe, as is sufficiently shown by the neat three-point stop, which in lines 2, 3, and 5 stands after the tribe genitive, whereas in line 4 Glaukon has a stop before, and not after, his name.

It is line 4 which claims special attention. Before the stop before Glaukon's name stands, not a tribe genitive, but ΕΣ, i.e., a nominative; there appear to be two strategoi in Glaukon's tribe. Glaukon was, on two known occasions

<sup>1</sup> I quote without prejudice the heading given in *IG*, Vol. I<sup>2</sup>.





is supplied in *IG*, Volume I<sup>2</sup>, from Thuc. i. 117. 2 as *τλεμ[ολεμος]*. This just ends the line.

If Tlempolemos comes in our list of strategoi there is only one place for him—at the end of line 5, after *χρε[νοφον κεκροτιδ]ος*.<sup>1</sup> This confirms the 35-letter line exactly, and it looks as if it confirms the 13-letter strategos in line 4. This is, however, impossible. Over the T of Tlempolemos there stands in the line above what can hardly be anything but I or T or possibly Y. If Lakēdaimonios were rightly restored in line 4, the letter must be Δ. And if Lakēdaimonios is not right, then we must either find some other 13-letter name (which is out of the question) or, it seems, abandon the 35-letter line which is demanded by line 5.

I can only suggest (I hope some better explanation may be found) that we must follow the Cockney who so notoriously misused his *h*'s in the Erechtheion records, and write as he does (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 374, l. 106), *HOINEIΔΟΣ*. Read, then, in lines 4–5, *[καλλ]ι[στρατος λοι] γειδος*.

Tlempolemos is thus our ninth strategos. The last letter of the tribe of the tenth comes in the next line, and after him the Boule. It is evident that we have been right to posit so long a name for the strategos of Oineis, for in this next line we have only twenty-three spaces for two tribe genitives and one strategos' name. It is certain the two tribes must be Aiantis and Antiochis, and that Hippothontis is the tribe without strategos this year; for if one of the tribe genitives was *χιπποθοντιδος*, the strategos' name would consist of one letter, or of none.<sup>2</sup> Tlempolemos, therefore, is of the tribe Aiantis, and the strategos of Antiochis has a name of 4 letters, e.g., Leon, Dion, etc.

### III

Before examining closer the sentences which precede and follow this catalogue of strategoi, it is best to consider the relation of these two fragments (*a* and *d*) to fragments *b* and *c* of *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 50. I owe the following account to the courtesy of Mr. Homer Thompson of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, who most kindly examined all four fragments.

The fragments are all in good Pentelic marble, showing an occasional light blue vein. One of these runs vertically through the middle of the surface of fragment *c*, and since I find no trace of it in fragment *a*, which also belongs to the right side of the stele, these two fragments could not be placed closely together. The faces of all the fragments are well preserved, and show a similar dressing, careful but not polished. The manner in which the backs of fragments *a* and *c* is finished seems distinctive and identical; the surface is roughly chisel dressed but parallel to the edge run two slightly depressed parallel bands separated by a central ridge, occupying in all a width of 10 cm. The thickness of *c* is 10 cm., that of *a* is 11 cm.,

<sup>1</sup> He cannot come higher, because of *βολε επχε* in the next line, nor lower, for that would make a list of more than ten strategoi.

<sup>2</sup> *χιπποθοντιδος* has 13 letters. With *αιαντιδος* it leaves one space for the strategos; with *αντιοχιδος* it leaves none.

so that if you combine them in one stele the latter will presumably have to go below. The lettering too seems closely similar. The lateral margins are of the same width. The spacing, so far as I can measure it, seems identical. The epigraphic variations are very slight. In the last line of fragment *a* all the strokes of the *mu* are carried down to the base line, which is not true of fragments *b* and *c*. Further, a triple point is used in *a* twice, in *d* three times, while a double point appears in *b* once.

There can be little question that the fragments are all from one stele; and in it *c* comes nearer the top, *a* and *d* nearer the foot.<sup>1</sup> Fragment *c* contains part of the oaths exchanged between the Samian and Athenian peoples; it is evident that we have a document similar to *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 71 (cf. also *ibid.*, 116, ll. 1-27), or those quoted in *Thuc.* v. 18-19 and 23-24, in which the terms of an agreement are set out, and then follow the names of the oath-takers (as we should say, "signatories") of each party.

The first line of fragment *d* may now be restored, *exempli gratia*.<sup>2</sup> [στ]ρατεγ[οι ομννον τον ηορκον (ho deiva) ερε]. This gives a name of 8 letters for the strategos of Erechtheis. It is most likely that the length of line was the same for the whole stele, viz., 35 letters. Consequently, the supplements suggested for fragment *c* in *IG*, Volume I<sup>2</sup>, and Hondius' *Novae inscriptiones Atticae*, page 19 (which presuppose a considerably longer line), will have to be revised. There seems little difficulty about restoring 35 letters *exempli gratia*, though I have no suggestions worth printing, and find line 27 especially stubborn.

The last lines of fragment *a* give the date, e.g., βολε ερχε ηο[τε] (ho deiva to deinos, 16 letters in all) προτ]οσ εγραμματαε ρα [μνοσιοσ vacat] vacat.<sup>3</sup>

## IV

The text of fragments *a* and *d* is given below, to which I append some notes.

[στ]ρατεγ[οι ομννον τον ηορκον:σοκρατες ερε]  
 χθειδοσ:δεμ[οκλειδεσ αιγειδοσ:φορμιον πα]  
 νδιονιδος:χ[. . . . .] λεοντιδος:περικλ]  
 εσ:γλαυκον α[καμαντιδος:καλλ]ε[στρατοσ ηοι]  
 ρειδος:χσε[μοφον κεκροπιδ]οσ:τλεμπ[ολεμοσ]  
 5 [αιαντιδος: . . . . .] αντιοχιδοσ:βολε ερχε ηο[τε]  
 [. . . . .] προτ]οσ εγραμματαε ρα  
 [μνοσιοσ                      vacat                      ]                      vacat

LINE 1.: I restore σοκρατες *exempli gratia* from the list of 441/0.

<sup>1</sup> The distinctive dressing of the back surfaces is, I think, conclusive; moreover, the identity of spacing is significant, since the letters are unusually far apart in proportion to their size. Variation in  $\mu$  within one document is not uncommon; the variation of the stop is more striking, but not really disturbing.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Thuc.* v. 19. 24; *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 116, l. 24.

<sup>3</sup> I hope to treat the question of exact date more fully at a later time, though it is clear that our inscription names the generals active in the summer of 439 after the capitulation of Samos.

LINE 2: If Phormion be rightly restored, the Aigeis strategos has a name of 11 letters beginning with Δεμ—. Not many names fit: Demokleides was the colonizer of Brea at about this time (*IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 45; cf. number 152). Nothing is known of his demotic.

LINE 3: Our scribe may easily have written περικλε|ε|ς, so the Leontis strategos may be one letter shorter.

LINE 6: The date formula with *ἵσα* is rare: *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 5 (ca. 500 B.C.), here (439 B.C.), and the document of 410 B.C. quoted by Andokides (i. 96). I do not see in the formula that anti-aristocratic tendency which Luria does (*Hermes*, LXII [1927], 265-70). Certainly his suggestion that *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 50, can be dated near *IG*, I<sup>2</sup>, 5, must be abandoned.<sup>1</sup>

H. T. WADE-GERY

WADHAM COLLEGE  
OXFORD

#### HOMERIC NOTES

β 203: χοήματα δ' αὐτε κακῶς βεβρώσεται, οὐδέ ποτ' ἴσα  
ἔσεται, ὅφρα κεν ἦ γε διατρίβῃσιν Ἀχαιοὺς  
ὄν γάμον.

The text is faulty in that (1) *ἴσα* seems used as a substantive "fair treatment," and (2) the *ς* of *ῥῖσα* is neglected. For criticism and attempts at emendation reference to Agar, *Homeric*, pages 26-27, may suffice, with the addition of Wilamowitz' recognition (*Heimkehr*, p. 103<sub>2</sub>) of the corruption and of the unsatisfactoriness of the efforts to remove it.

I suggest that ICA of the sixth-century archetype has been interpreted as *ἴσα*, when in reality *ἴσσα* was meant. The mistake is of the same type as that which concealed *ἴσσης* under *ἴσης* in ὥς μή τίς μοι ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσσης (ι 42=549 ∞ A[705]), until pointed out by Fick (*Odyssey* 20) with the aid of Hesychios' gloss: ἴσσαισθαι · κληροῦσθαι. Λέσβιοι. I translate: "His property shall be eaten despitefully, and he shall never have his heritage [his share in his father's possessions], as long as, etc." In substance this was the idea of Bentley in proposing *αἴσα*—a suggestion approved hesitatingly by Nauck.

The relation of *αἴσα* to *ἴσσα* is in principle like that of *deus* to *divos*, for these Greek words grow out of an Indo-European paradigm \**áitya*, \**ityās*, with shifting accent and consequent differences of ablaut. Parallels may be found in Hirt, *Handbuch*,<sup>2</sup> page 342; Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.*, III, 166.

E 249: ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ χαζώμεθ' ἐφ' ἵππων, μηδὲ μοι οὔτω  
θῦνε διὰ προμάχων, μὴ πως φίλον ἦτορ ὀλέσσης.

<sup>1</sup> I have to thank the late Dr. Leonardos for the facilities he gave me for studying and publishing this inscription; and, besides those scholars I have already named, especially B. D. Meritt for his unflinching encouragement and help.

I cite the scholia, οὕτως Ἀρίσταρχος ἐφ' ἵππων, ὡς εἰ ἔλεγεν ἐπ' Ἀθηνῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπ' Ἀθήνας . . . (ΣΑ). ὅτι Ἀττικῶς ἐξενήνοχεν ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους (ΣΑ'), and Leaf's note:

But it is hardly possible that this (Aristarchus' interpretation) should be the sense here, for we cannot suppose that Sthenelos, whose function is that of charioteer, can have left the horses so far as to advise Diomedes to retreat in their direction. We must therefore take it in the ordinary sense of "retreat upon the chariot" (as Ω 356).

This note brings out well the difficulties that have been generally felt in the interpretation of the passage, though reference to Ameis-Hentze, *Anhang*, II<sup>2</sup>, 91-92, may be added. The difficulties vanish if we will note that χαζώμεθα is a plural of courtesy, actually meaning no more than χάζεο—a view that is supported by the parallel phrase μηδέ μοι οὕτω θύνε. This use of the plural is discussed by Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, II, 42-44, with illustrations from Homer, though with none which touches so directly the interpretation of the text.

It may help us to appreciate the courtesy of this illogical plural if we recall that it is only opponents who shout at a man χάζεο (E 440 II 707 P 13 λ 97); the closest approach to it among friends being Hector's μὴ δὴ πω χάζεσθε (O 426), where the plural and the negative minimize the offensiveness of the term.

Finally, it seems that χάζεσθαι and "in a chariot" are incompatible. The word is not as broad as our "retreat," but properly denotes the giving ground by a πρόμαχος as in the frequent formulas χάζετο δ' εἰς ἔθνος ἑταίρων and χασσάμενος πελεμίσθη. There are extensions of meaning of course. Thus Patroklos when assailed by Apollo ἀνεχάζετο πολλόν (II 710), but the distance is at the most only relatively great, even if Zenodotos has not preserved in τυτθόν the original text, on which πολλόν is an overclever improvement. Again (N 740) Polydamas says ἀλλ' ἀναχασσάμενος κάλει ἐνθάδε πάντας ἀρίστους, and Hector takes it to mean, not that he is to drop back and shout for the chieftains, but that he is to go around and find them. There is also to be mentioned E 34 where Athene says to Ares νῶϊ δὲ χαζώμεσθα, Διὸς δ' ἀλεώμεθα μῆνιν, apparently in the sense of "let us quit the battle." But that line is superfluous and contains a premature reference to the eighth book.

Noteworthy on the other hand is P 129-30, where Hector first gives ground (ἀνεχάζετο) and then mounts his chariot. There are but two passages in which a man seems to χάζεσθαι in a chariot, and neither will bear examination.

In the curious passage A 531-42 Hector is described (531-37) as driving to the point of danger, and then we are told:

ὁ δὲ ἵετο δύναι δμῖλον  
 ἀνδρόμεον ῥῆξαι τε μετάλμενος· ἐν δὲ κυδοιμὸν  
 ἦκε κακὸν Δαναοῖσι, μίνυνθα δὲ χάζετο δουρός.  
 αὐτὰρ ὁ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπεπωλεῖτο στίχας ἀνδρῶν  
 ἕγχέϊ τ' ἄορι τε μεγάλαισι τε χερμαδίοισιν  
 Αἴαντος δ' ἀλείψει μάχην Τελαμωνιάδαο.

Various interpretations of the phrase *μίννθα δὲ χάζετο δούρος* are cited in Leaf; the most popular, perhaps, being that it is a metaphor amounting to "he gave his spear no rest." If so, the passage is irrelevant to our question. I doubt, however, the need of so interpreting it. Hector is clearly, as the "great stones" show, on foot at the close of the passage, and the trouble is due to the fact that his dismounting is not described. The author may have thought that it was suggested sufficiently by *μετάλμενος*; or he may even have associated *ζέρο* with the middle of *ζημι* and felt it to mean "rushed." At all events, if Hector is on foot at this point, there is no difficulty in translating: "And he sent evil Panic among the Danaans, for little [i.e., not at all] would he draw back from a spear."

The other passage is E 822 where Diomedes uses *ἀναχάζομαι* in describing his conduct during the orderly retreat of the Achaeans. As he was found standing by his horses and chariot (794) this raises in reality no problem. It is noted, however, because a little later (837) he is in his chariot, without his mounting of it having been mentioned.

The consequence is that while *φεύγωμεν ἐφ' ἵππων* (Ω 356), "Let us flee in the chariot," offers no difficulty, it is impossible to interpret *χαζώμεθ' ἐφ' ἵππων* as "Let us retreat in the chariot."

The conclusion is not affected by Ameis-Hentze's objection to *ἐφ' ἵππων*, "toward the chariot." That merely raises another issue: whether this or the implied variant *ἐφ' ἵππους* is the better. It seems likely that *ἐφ' ἵππων* is Atticistic, and then *ἐφ' ἵππους* is more probably the reading of the archetype than a successful emendation.

In the *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XVI (1930), 187-93, H. J. M. Milne prints fragments of Dio Chrysostom from P. Mus. Brit. 2823, a codex of the fourth century. In Fragment 4, verso, belonging to some lost work occur

|ει δ' οὕτω δε|  
|ος Ἀχαιῶν νῆα.|  
|γῆς δοκεῖ δε μ|

The editor notes that here is a quotation from Homer, but does not locate it. Since the sequence -ος Ἀχαιῶν νῆα occurs but once in our poems, the lines are clearly μ 184-85, and may be restored:

λεγ|ει δ' οὕτω δε|υρ' ἀγ' ἰων πολυαῖν' Ὀδυσσεύ μεγα  
κυδ|ος Ἀχαιῶν νῆα κ|αταστήσῃν ἵνα κοιτερῇν οἶ' α  
κου|γῆς δοκεῖ δε μ|οι

The length of the lines accords well with that determinable in Fragment 1.

Thanks to the kindness of Mr. Milne in answering my queries I can explain the slight differences between the text here offered and the original publication. It had been noted that the letter after νῆα was not σ but perhaps δ; the suggestion of κ seems to have caused no difficulty. In the hand of this papyrus γ and σ differ only in that the latter has a curl at the bottom. At the beginning

of the third of these lines is visible a perfect  $\gamma$ , but there is a break in the papyrus which can have carried away the curl of a sigma, and no doubt did so. There is therefore no need to think of  $\gamma$  designating a spirant, and of an otherwise-unattested variant  $\delta\kappa\acute{o}\upsilon\gamma\varsigma$ .

These lines are quoted also in Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* xii. 118, but no other *testimonium* for them is cited.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

#### PROSKYNESIS AND ABASEMENT IN AESCHYLUS

Proskynesis is specifically mentioned only twice by Aeschylus, once in the *Persians*, when the barbarian army, blocked in its northern flight by the frozen Strymon, prostrates itself in terror ( $\gammaαῖαν οὐρανὸν τε προσκυνῶν$ );<sup>1</sup> once when the chorus in the *Prometheus vinculus* warns the relentless Prometheus of the folly of opposing destiny ( $οἱ προσκυννοῦντες τὴν Ἀδράστειαν σοφοῖ$ ).<sup>2</sup> In the former example the exigencies of time, place, and character justify the conduct of the Persians. In the latter the bitter refusal of Prometheus to do obedience to Zeus, his master in Olympus, reflects the ingrained repugnance of the Greeks for servility among themselves.<sup>3</sup>

Yet neither of these incidents affords any unusual insight into the feeling of Aeschylus toward abasement, which is best illustrated in a few places where proskynesis is not specifically mentioned, but is clearly implied. Such an instance of unseemly abasement occurs in the *Persians*, when the chorus, closing their long introductory chant, see Atossa approaching in her gorgeous apparel, and address her with all the extravagance of the Persian court.<sup>4</sup> The chorus prostrate themselves on the ground,<sup>5</sup> and Atossa is hailed as  $θεοῦ εἰνάτεια Περσῶν$  and  $θεοῦ μήτηρ$ .<sup>6</sup> The speech itself, with its massed epithets of address, suggests the invocation of a deity.<sup>7</sup> But the chorus know no restraint. Divine is she, the wife and mother of gods. This is an instance of proskynesis before a mortal,<sup>8</sup> which Aeschylus has employed as the most effective way to recall to his audience the generations of haughty arrogance so soon to be humbled.<sup>9</sup> In contrast, seemly prostration is illustrated in the

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* 499.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.* 936.

<sup>3</sup> This attitude of god to god is, however, in no sense an indication of the normal feeling of the Greeks in their contact with the divine powers. Cf. *Seven against Thebes* 596,  $\deltaεινὸς δὲ θεοῖς σέβει$ ; *Choeph.* 637,  $σέβει γὰρ οὐτὶς τὸ δυσφιλὲς θεοῖς$ .

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* 150 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 152,  $προσπίττω$ . M reads  $προσπίτνω$   $προσκυνῶ$ , where  $προσκυνῶ$  is clearly a gloss, but a significant one. Cf. Eurip. *Orest.* 1507.

<sup>6</sup> *Pers.* 157.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Agam.* 782 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. the lament of the chorus (*Pers.* 588-89) when they fear that Xerxes must forfeit this reverence from the Persians.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *ibid.* 929-31, where the chorus, bewailing to the stricken Xerxes the slaughter of the host, picture the land of Asia bowed in humility to her knees.

chorus of maidens in the *Seven against Thebes*, as they chant their long strain of lament and supplication.<sup>1</sup> Despite Eteocles, who mocks them for their idle womanish terror, the maidens yield to the force of reverence and tradition. In falling at the feet of the gods in supplication for the safety of their city they are merely conforming to an accepted form of Greek piety.

It is in harmony with the genius of Aeschylus that many of the references to abasement or implied proskynesis are couched in the metaphorical language of cringing, fawning, or coaxing animals.<sup>2</sup> The fawning of courtiers and flatterers is invariably described with Hellenic distaste. In the closing lines of the *Agamemnon*, for instance, Aegisthus, outraged by the insolence of the elders, must be reminded οὐκ ἂν 'Αργείων τόδ' εἴη, φῶτα προσσαίνειν κακόν.<sup>3</sup> Aeschylus also avails himself of the same metaphor of the fawning animal, whose human counterpart is named or hinted in the court, to illustrate treacherous humility. Thus Helen, who came in her loveliness to Troy, only to bring bitter grief to the children of Priam, is likened to the playful, fawning lion cub, which learned with time the savage nature of its stock and wreaked its fury on the home.<sup>4</sup> Similarly, Aeschylus may transfer the language appropriate to a dog deprecating punishment to the wicked beseeching mercy when their guilt has been made manifest. The point is illustrated in the cringing pleas of Klytemnestra before the implacability of her children.<sup>5</sup> The metaphor is likewise applied to one who cringes before death in battle. In the *Seven against Thebes* Tydeus hurls at the son of Oecles the bitter taunt of weakly fawning (σαίνειν) before destruction.<sup>6</sup> The scholiast explains the word as ἐκκλίνειν. Oeclides would ward off fate as a dog deprecates his master's blow. Of similar signification is the use of σαίνειν in the weary plaint of Eteocles in the same play.<sup>7</sup> Forsaken by the gods, he would no longer fawn upon the doom of destruction. This time the scholiast explains the word as κολακεύειν.

The most subtly developed example of implied proskynesis occurs in the *Agamemnon*. Klytemnestra has welcomed the return of her lord,<sup>8</sup> and the chorus have greeted him with a deference, a multiplicity of titles, and a meticulous care in choosing an acceptable term of address,<sup>9</sup> which, like the greeting of the Persian elders to Atossa, suggest the salutation of a god. Both the

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.* 78 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It is not to be supposed that προσκύνεσις is etymologically connected with κύνων. It seems clear that the word is to be derived from κυνέω (see Scott, *Class. Jour.*, XVII, 403-4).

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.* 1665. Cf. the warning of the chorus to Agamemnon of the treacherous nobles who will fawn upon him ἰδραεὶ φιλότῃτι (798).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 717 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Choeph.* 418-22, 896-98; cf. *Soph. Elec.* 1404 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.* 383.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.* 587 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 702-4.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 782-87.



chorus<sup>1</sup> and the queen<sup>2</sup> would avoid provoking Nemesis, but by the very excess of their language they inevitably and inexorably rouse it against their lord. When Klytemnestra bids her husband step from the chariot on to the purple she must be visualized as bowing in mock servility to the ground.<sup>3</sup> It is this act of proskynesis that stirs grisly fear in the mind of Agamemnon and provokes his sharp rebuke: μή . . . χαμαιπετές βόαμα προσχάνης ἐμοί.<sup>4</sup> If further proof of the interpretation be needed, it is to be found later in the play in the prophetic vision of Cassandra. In the frenzy of true prophecy she sees Aegisthus, the skulking lion, plotting death for her master, and the vile dog, Klytemnestra, veiling the treachery of her purpose with hollow blandishments.<sup>5</sup> The vision of Cassandra is based on the proskynesis of Klytemnestra's treacherous, unbridled, and fawning joy at Agamemnon's return.

The two explicit references to proskynesis in Aeschylus add little in themselves to the interpretation of the word. Dread obeisance for a barbarian, seemly prostration for a Greek, are the proper evidences of humility before the ineluctable purpose of necessity.<sup>6</sup> For this reason Aeschylus proceeds with extreme caution when conduct so foreign to the Greeks of his day is imputed to anyone in the drama. There can be little doubt, however, that he vivified the essentially Greek conception of impending Nemesis by verging on the suggestion of that un-Hellenic obeisance before a mortal, which would most effectively provoke the intolerance of heaven.

It may be concluded, therefore, that Aeschylus refers to the act of *προσκύνησις* as a seemly supplication of the gods, while giving it an unfavorable or cowardly connotation as it pertains to mortals. In the former instance it may be interpreted as "obeisance"; in the latter, as "deprecation," or by some other word of derogatory signification.

H. N. COUCH

BROWN UNIVERSITY

#### TRIBAL BOUNDARIES IN BELGIC GAUL

In his discussion of the extent of Roman territory T. Rice Holmes<sup>7</sup> follows Walckenaer and Desjardins in including within it the diocese of Laon which he assumes to have belonged to the Remi because of the fact that it was separated from the diocese of Reims in the fifth century. That a portion at least

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* 785.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* 904.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* 904-7 (see Schneidewin's note *ad loc. cit.*, vss. 885 ff. according to his numbering).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 918-20 (see the translation of H. Weir Smyth in the Loeb Classical Library).

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* 1223 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See Jebb, *Sophocles: Oed. Col.*, note on vs. 130, for a comment on the practice of the Greeks in approaching or passing the shrine of a deity.

<sup>7</sup> *Conquest of Gaul*,<sup>2</sup> p. 468.

of the new diocese of Laon had belonged to the see of Reims is well attested by the statement of Hincmar, archbishop of Reims in the ninth century (*Vita S. Remigii*, § 41 f.):

Baptizatus autem rex [i.e., Clovis] cum gente integra, plurimas possessiones per diversas provincias sancto Remigio, tam ipse quam Franci potentes dederunt: quos ipse per diversas ecclesias tradidit. . . . [42] De quibus rebus in orientalibus Franciae partibus, petentibus traditoribus, portionem quamdam episcopo Rhemensi adjunxit; et de his quae in Rhemensi provincia illi fuerunt traditae, non modicam partem ecclesiae sanctae mariae in castro Lauduni clavati Rhemensis parochiae, ubi nutritus fuerat, tradidit: ibique Genebaudum . . . episcopum ordinavit, et parochiam ipsius comitatus Laudunensis praefato castro subiecit.

Similarly, in the next century Flodoard, canon of Reims, writes (*Hist. eccl. Remensis*, i, 14 *init.*):

Rex igitur, Francorumque potentes, beato Remigio possessiones per diversas contulere provincias, ex quibus ille tam Remensem quam reliquas non nullas Franciae dotavit ecclesias. Non modicam necnon earundem partem rerum ecclesiae sanctae Mariae Lauduni clavati, Remensis parochiae castri, ubi nutritus fuerat tradidit: ibique Genebaudum . . . ordinavit episcopum, comitatusque Laudunensis eidem castro subiecit parochiam.

In Sigebert's chronicle these events are placed in the year 500, but may have occurred two or three years earlier.<sup>1</sup>

Accepting the foregoing statements as evidence that the entire diocese of Laon was included in the territory of the Remi, Holmes has prepared a map of Gaul on which approximately one-half of the Reman country is shown lying north of the Aisne River. This is quite contrary to Caesar's express statement in *BG* ii. 5. 4 f., which is as follows:

. . . Flumen Axonam, quod est in extremis Remorum finibus, exercitum traducere maturavit atque ibi castra posuit. quae res et latus unum castrorum ripis fluminis muniebat et post eum quae erant tuta ab hostibus reddebat et commeatus ab Remis reliquisque civitatibus ut sine periculo ad eum portari possent efficiebat.

Not only does he say that the location which he chose for his camp afforded him the natural protection of the river; he gives us more important reasons for the choice of the site. It was his purpose to protect as much of the territory of his new allies as he could and to assure them that they could give undivided attention to the collection and transport of the supplies necessary for his army. For this reason he acted quickly and moved his forces to the most suitable point near the northern boundary of Reman territory. While some of the land belonging to the Remi, including at least one town, Bibrax, was not afforded protection by the Roman position, the extent of the territory exposed to hostile attack was probably not great, for when the Belgian allies attempted to force a crossing of the Aisne, Caesar gives as one of their reasons a desire to devastate the land of the Remi, and does not even allude to the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. AA.SS., Sept., II, 538B; *Sainte-Marthe, Gallia Christiana*, IX (1751), 510C.

devastation already inflicted upon the district north of the Aisne, leaving the impression that it was not of great significance. Altogether it is obvious that the statements of the *Commentaries* will hardly support the opinion held by Walckenaer, Desjardins, and Holmes.

If, then, the diocese of Laon was not entirely embraced within Roman boundaries, to which of the surrounding tribes should it be assigned? I think it could hardly have belonged to the Nervii, for the Remi informed Caesar that these people were the most remote of the Belgians<sup>1</sup>—an expression which they would hardly have used to describe near neighbors across the Aisne. Neither does it seem probable that the entire district belonged to the Treveri, for if it had these people could hardly have escaped being involved in the battle of the Aisne, where they are mentioned neither as friends nor as foes of the Romans, though a lukewarm friendliness may be assumed.

The remaining tribes whose lands surrounded, if they did not include, the territory in dispute were the Atuatucae, the Suessiones, and the Viromandui. It seems impossible to define in any satisfactory way the district occupied by the Atuatucae at the time Caesar began the Belgian campaign. They were a relatively powerful tribe, for they had made the Eburones their tributaries,<sup>2</sup> and their importance is further indicated by the part they played in the Belgian opposition to Roman arms. It is difficult to believe that so important a people held only the restricted territory described by Holmes, and it is not impossible that they possessed a portion of the diocese of Laon, yet evidence that they did so is entirely lacking.

A somewhat stronger case can be made for the claims of the Suessiones. They also were a powerful tribe whose recent king, Diviciacus, had been the most influential man in Gaul. The Remi emphasized the great extent of their territories (*latissimos fines*) and the number of their towns, and reported that they had promised to raise an army of fifty-thousand men.<sup>3</sup> Now the diocese of Soissons, even with the diocese of Senlis added to it, seems too small to have been described in the terms used by the Remi, and I believe we are justified in assuming that a portion, at least, of the diocese of Laon belonged to this nation. Support for the assumption is found in an amusing incident recounted by Flodoard.<sup>4</sup> After his conversion to Christianity, Clovis established his court in the country of the Suessiones and, because of his attachment to St. Remigius, kept him in his presence. Since Remigius had no fitting abode in the neighborhood of the court, Clovis promised to give him all the land that he could encompass on foot while the king was taking his midday siesta. The inhabitants of Caviniacum (Chavignon) prevented the bishop from including their town, but Remigius completed his walk and was made possessor of the territory he had encircled. The most important of his new possessions were Luliacus and Codiciacus (Leuilly and Coucy), which were

<sup>1</sup> BG ii. 4. 8: "Nervios qui maxime feri inter ipsos habeantur longissimeque absint."

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. v. 27. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ii. 4. 6 and 7.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., I, 14.

still in undisputed possession of the bishopric of Reims in the time of Flodoard.<sup>1</sup> Codiciacus is identical with Cociacus or Coucy, and that town, according to Sainte-Marthe's *Gallia Christiana*, was formerly within the diocese of Laon,<sup>2</sup> yet it is very definitely implied in the narratives of Hincmar and Flodoard that prior to the time when it was given to Remigius it had been a portion of the country of the Suessiones.

It is even possible that the Viromandui should receive some attention in this connection. It is hardly sufficient to state, as Holmes does, that this tribe occupied the diocese of Noyon, without offering some explanation for the discrepancy between his map and Caesar's statement (ii. 15. 3) that the lands of the Nervii were contiguous to those of the Ambiani. I see no reason for doubting Caesar's accuracy on this point, and some readjustment of the boundaries on Holmes's map is therefore necessary.

Now, since Caesar's march from Samarobriva to the relief of Cicero's camp among the Nervians took him through the country of the Atrebatas,<sup>3</sup> it seems hardly probable that the land of the Nervii extended farther west or that of the Ambiani farther north than shown in Holmes's map, for in either case the direct route from the one to the other would have missed the Atreban country entirely. Accordingly we must suppose that the territory of the Nervii extended southward or the land of the Ambiani eastward into the diocese of Noyon. But if so, what lands did the Viromandui possess? The diocese of Noyon is so small that if any considerable district in its northwest portion belonged to adjacent tribes, the country of the Viromandui must have been very small indeed, or it must have extended eastward into the diocese of Laon. There is no evidence for this extension eastward other than that which may be inferred from the participation of the Viromandui in the battle of the Sambre. It seems strange that Caesar could have led a victorious army from the Aisne through the countries of the Suessiones, the Bellovaci, and the Ambiani, and back into the country of the Nervii, thus almost completely encircling the present diocese of Noyon without alienating the inhabitants of that detached district from the common cause of the Nervii and their other allies. The presence of the Viromandui at the battle of the Sambre would be much easier to explain if it could be shown that their territory was more closely consolidated with that of the Nervii and Atuatuaci, as it would be if it included, for example, the portion of the bishopric of Laon north of the Oise.

Although admitting that the evidence for tribal boundaries in Caesar's day is distressingly vague, I feel that in the case of the peoples of Belgic Gaul, at least, Holmes has followed too slavishly the "law of the dioceses."

JAMES E. DUNLAP

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

<sup>1</sup> In Hincmar (*Vita S. Remigii*, § 46) these names appear incorrectly Judiacus and Ociliacus. In Flodoard's work they are given as Juliacus and Codiciacus. Juliacus (=Juilly) is geographically impossible. For the probable correction Luliacus I am indebted to Melleville, *Dictionnaire historique du département de l'Aisne* (Laon and Paris, 1857), I, 358, also 156.

<sup>2</sup> It is now in the diocese of Soissons.

<sup>3</sup> *BG* v. 46. 3.

QUINQUENNALIS PERPETUUS AS TITLE FOR A  
MUNICIPAL MAGISTRATE

An interesting problem is raised by an inscription from Carales in Sardinia (*CIL*, X, 7599 [Dessau, 6763]).<sup>1</sup> With ligatures resolved, it reads as follows:

Q·GABINIO·A·F·QVIR  
R E C E P T O  
IIIIVIRO·IVR·DIC  
QVINQ·PERPETVO  
FLAMINI·DIVOR·AVG  
EX·CONSENSV·PROVIN

The inscription obviously concerns a man who has held municipal office and also has served as *flamen* of the imperial cult of the province. In his Index (p. 573) Dessau hesitates to decide whether the cult in question was a municipal or provincial cult. Mommsen, on the other hand, in the Index of *CIL*, X, p. 1136, indicates that the cult is the cult of the province of Sardinia. Kornemann (Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 805) also cites the inscription as evidence for the provincial cult. In my opinion, the phrase *ex consensu provinciae* proves that we are in the presence of the provincial cult, though other inscriptions suggest that the title of the provincial high priest was *sacerdos* (cf. *CIL*, X, 7917, and the reference to *sacerdotes* in *CIL*, X, 7518 [Dessau, 6764]). Kornemann (Pauly-Wissowa, IV, 812) believes that the solution is that Sardinia first employed the title *flamen* and later changed to that of *sacerdos provinciae*.

The problem raised by the inscription is whether *perpetuo* is to be joined to the preceding *quinq.* or to the *flamini* of the next line, i.e., whether the inscription contains a reference to a *quinquennalis perpetuus* or to a *perpetuus flamen*. Mommsen in his Index to *CIL*, Vol. X, on both p. 1142 and p. 1159, connects *perpetuus* with *quinquennalis*. On page 1159 the inscription is quoted *s.v.* "IIIIvir iure dicundo quinquennalis perpetuus." On page 1142 *quinquennalis perpetuus* is listed by itself. Dessau, on the other hand, in his Index (pp. 573 and 574) connects *perpetuus* with *flamen*. A glance at the inscription will show two points in favor of connecting the *perpetuo* with *quinq.* In the first place, the division into lines has been so carefully made that it would be surprising to find a break between two titles in the middle of a line. It would not have been difficult to arrange the material in such a way as to avoid this break. To suggest only one possibility, *quinquennalis*, if written in full, would suffice for one line, *perpetuo flamini* would make a second, while *divor. Augustorum* would not be too long for a third. In the second place, the order of words makes it more natural to connect *perpetuo* with *quinq.* A reference to the Index of Dessau is enough to suggest how much more frequent *flamen perpetuus* is than *perpetuus flamen*. When Dessau refuses to connect *quinq.*

<sup>1</sup> All references to Dessau are to his *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*.

and *perpetuo*, this must be on account of a feeling that *quinquennalis perpetuus* as a title of a municipal magistrate is impossible. My own impression is that it is not impossible, but that *quinquennalis perpetuus* may have been employed for a magistrate that actually served for only one year but retained the title and certain dignities for life.

I happened upon the inscription in connection with interest in provincial assemblies and the priests that presided over the assemblies. From the point of view of such interests it is desirable to know whether the *perpetuo* is to be connected with *flamini* or not. To be compelled to connect the two words in no sense would alarm me or even convince me that the provincial high priest of Sardinia held office for life. Such an exception to the normal rule of western provinces of an annual term would not be completely impossible. Yet, at least in the municipal cults of the province of Africa, the term *flamen perpetuus* was applied to priests who did not actually serve as *flamines* for life.<sup>1</sup> In the same manner the provincial high priest of Sardinia might well be called *perpetuus flamen* and yet be the active head of the cult merely for a year. This would all be very interesting, but I do not think our inscription supplies any evidence for such a conclusion.

To return to *quinquennalis perpetuus*, the term was not uncommon in the guilds. Illustrations are given in the Index of Dessau (p. 724) and by Waltzing (*Corporations professionnelles chez les romains*, IV, 353 f.). Waltzing (*op. cit.*, I, 387) believes that at times the title was used as an honorary title for former presidents. Reference has already been made to a somewhat similar use of *flamen perpetuus* in municipal cults. In municipalities, meanwhile, former *quinquennales* at times were called *quinquennalicii*. As an example of this title, it is enough to refer to the *album* of Canusium (Dessau, 6121). Would it be surprising if some municipality should follow the example of guilds and municipal cults and employ the title *quinquennalis perpetuus*? At present I can point to no examples besides this one from Carales, but other localities may still supply illustrations. In the present case the full title seems to have been *quattorvir iure dicundo quinquennalis perpetuus*.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

#### PLATO *SOPHIST* 236 C AND LAWS 668 A ff.

The contradiction which Wilamowitz (*Platon*, I, 479) following Finsler (*Platon und die Aristotelische Poetik*, p. 24) finds between *Sophist* 236 C and *Laws* 668 A and C disappears on a critical examination of the texts. In the *Sophist*, and merely for the purpose of defining the sophist, Plato distinguishes two ways of producing εἰδωλα or φαντάσματα or appearances. The one effects

<sup>1</sup> Geiger, *De sacerdotibus Augustorum municipalibus* (Halle, 1913), pp. 46 ff.

a real likeness and so may be called with a reference to the etymology *εἰκαστική*. The other produces a subjective illusion in the mind or imagination of the victim and may be called *φανταστική*. The distinction applies to painting and to all mimetic arts. The art of the sophist belongs to the second and inferior category. He does not even produce a likeness, but only the appearance or illusion of a likeness. Aristotle's definition of the sophist as one who profits *ἀπὸ φαινομένης σοφίας*<sup>1</sup> may have been suggested by this. At any rate, Plato's purpose is apparent, as is the relevancy of his distinction to his purpose. He wishes to assign the sophist to the inferior branch of his dichotomy.

In *Laws* 668 A, speaking generally and with no such special purpose in mind, he says that all music (meaning music and poetry) is eikastic and mimetic, and repeats the statement in C in the form that all the productions of music (*ποιήματα*) are *μίμησις τε καὶ ἀπεικασία*. The disparaging words *ἑδωλον* and *φάντασμα* are not used and *μίμησις* and *ἀπεικασία* bracketed by *τε καὶ* are virtually synonyms, and merely express the general doctrine that music, in the larger sense, is an art of imitation. There is no occasion for the very special distinction of the *Sophist*, which would be pointless here, and it is uncritical therefore to argue that Plato has withdrawn or forgotten it. The two words are used as naturally for fuller emphasis as they are in Aristotle's expression (1447 a 19) *πολλὰ μιμοῦνται τινες ἀπεικάζοντες*.

When Wilamowitz and Finsler accuse Plato of forgetting the distinction of the *Sophist* in the late *Laws*, they overlook the fact that by their reasoning he forgot it much earlier, for the *Critias* is surely earlier than the *Laws* in their opinion. And in the *Critias* 107 B Plato combines *μίμησις* and *ἀπεικασία* as virtual synonyms in precisely the same way, *μίμησιν μὲν γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἀπεικασίαν τὰ παρὰ πάντων ἡμῶν ῥηθέντα χρεὼν πον γενέσθαι*.

To sum up the common sense of the matter, in the *Sophist* and in order to disparage the sophist, Plato says that we may distinguish two kinds of imitation in all the mimetic arts, that which produces a likeness and that which produces an illusion. He employs a similar if not precisely identical distinction in *Republic* 380 D for another purpose. Elsewhere, when he has no such purpose in mind and is merely speaking of the general theory of art, he amplifies "imitation" by the addition of the virtual synonym "representation," and says art is imitation and representation. This, as the passage of Aristotle quoted shows, is a perfectly natural mode of expression, and it is the height of hypercriticism to read into it a contradiction or withdrawal of the special point that there are tricky arts for which illusion is a better name than representation or the production of an objective likeness.

Incidentally I may add that Plato had apparently not forgotten his *Sophist*, as the repetition of the quip *εἰκὼν ὄντως*<sup>2</sup> would seem to indicate.

PAUL SHOREY

<sup>1</sup> *Soph. Elenchi* i. 165 a 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Laws* 668 C 7; *Soph.* 240 B 11.



## A CONJECTURAL RESTORATION OF IG, II, 2, 966B

IG, II, 2, 966B, 21-35, records four victors in the Panathenean games in the chariot races for which specific descriptions are lacking. The victors are Mikion (l. 21), Eumenes (l. 31), Philetairos (l. 33), and Athenaios (l. 35). Between Mikion and Eumenes four other victors are listed, namely, Diokles in the ἵππῳ τελείῳ (l. 23), Kalliphon in the ἵππῳ [ . . . . . ] (l. 25), Agathokles in the ἀκάμπιον (l. 27), and Attalos ἐν τῷ ἵπποδρόμῳ. Ferguson<sup>1</sup> has set the date of 178 B.C. for IG, II, 2, 966B, and 182 B.C. for IG, II 2, 966A. Th. Klee<sup>2</sup> accepts both of these dates as being very plausible. In 966A the order for the chariot races was as follows: Ptolemaios won in the ἄρματι δίαυλον (l. 41), Mikion in the ἄρματι ἀκάμπιον (l. 44), two other events are interposed, then Zeuxo is listed as victor in the ἄρματι πωλικῷ (l. 50), again two other events are listed, and finally we have Epiphanes as victor in the ἄρματι τελείῳ (l. 56). In IG, II, 2, 967A (190 or 194 B.C.),<sup>3</sup> only two of the foregoing events are listed, a victor in the ἄρματι πωλικῷ, then three other events, and a victor in the ἄρματι τελείῳ. IG, II, 2, 967B (186 or 190 B.C.),<sup>4</sup> also lists only these two but in this same order and with no other events intervening. IG, II, 2, 969A (162 B.C.),<sup>5</sup> gives the same result with one event intervening and IG, II, 2, 969B (158 B.C.), lists victors in the ἄρματι δίαυλον, ἄρματι ἀκάμπιον, in another event, and in the ἄρματι πολεμιστηρίῳ. IG, II, 2, 968 (166 B.C.), lists victors in the ἄρματι πωλικῷ, one other event, ἄρματι τελείῳ, one other event, and ἄρματι πολεμιστηρίῳ.

In all of the foregoing inscriptions, exclusive of 966B, five types of chariot races are recorded, namely, the ἄρματι δίαυλον, ἄρματι ἀκάμπιον, ἄρματι πωλικῷ, ἄρματι τελείῳ, and ἄρματι πολεμιστηρίῳ. In 966A and 969B the ἄρματι δίαυλον and ἄρματι ἀκάμπιον are the first two types listed. The ἄρματι πωλικῷ is followed by the ἄρματι τελείῳ either immediately or with non-chariot events intervening in 966A, 967A and B, 969A, and 968. There are four lacunae to be filled in 966B, and I prefer to disregard the ἄρματι πολεμιστηρίῳ due to the closer relationship between 966B and 966A than that between 966B and 969A and B or 968. I propose, therefore, the following restorations in IG, II, 2, 966B:

- L. 20:                    ἄρμα[τι<δίαυλον>]  
Μικίων Εὐρυκλ[είδου Ερεχθείδος φυλῆς]  
L. 30:                    ἄρμα[τι<ἀκάμπιον>]  
Βασιλεὺς Εὐμ[ένης βασιλέως Ἀττάλου]  
L. 32:                    ἄρ[ματι<πωλικῷ>]  
Φιλέται[ρος βασιλέως Ἀττάλου]  
L. 34:                    [ἄρματι<τελείῳ>]  
Ἀθηναῖος [βασιλέως Ἀττάλου]

HENRY C. MONTGOMERY

WABASH COLLEGE

<sup>1</sup> *Klio*, VIII (1908), 355.<sup>2</sup> *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone in griechischen Festen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1918), pp. 28 f.<sup>3</sup> Ferguson, *loc. cit.*<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*; Klee, *loc. cit.*

## A NOTE ON HORACE AND DU BELLAY

Neither Vianey<sup>1</sup> nor Stemplinger<sup>2</sup> appears to have noticed the connection between the closing sonnet of Du Bellay's *Antiquitez de Rome* and Horace's *Odes* iii. 30, though this connection is of some interest. Du Bellay's poem is as follows:

Esperez-vous que la posterité  
Doive (mes vers) pour tout jamais vous lire?  
Esperez-vous que l'oeuvre d'une lyre  
Puisse acquérir telle immortalité?  
Si sous le ciel fust quelque éternité,  
Les monuments que je vous ay fait dire,  
Non en papier, mais en marbre et porphyre,  
Eussent gardé leur vive antiquité.  
Ne laisse pas toutefois de sonner,  
Luth, qu'Apollon m'a bien daigné donner:  
Car si le temps ta gloire ne desrobbe,  
Vanter te peux, quelque bas que tu sois,  
D'avoir chanté le premier des François,  
L'antique honneur du peuple à longue robbe.

This poem, as well as Horace's, shows clearly the stamp of the age in which it was written, but the points of similarity can be easily seen by a comparison of the two works, and the influence of the Roman poet upon Du Bellay is unmistakable. Lines 5-8 of the sonnet should also be compared with the following epigram (Buecheler-Riese, *Anthologia Latina*, I, No. 418):

Nullum opus exsurgit, quod non annosa vetustas  
expugnet, quod non vertat iniqua dies,  
tu licet extollas magnos ad sidera montes  
et calidas aequas marmore pyramidas.  
Ingenio mors nulla nocet, vacat undique tutum,  
inlaesum semper carmina nomen habent.

Du Bellay appears to have had in mind the antithesis used by the writer of this epigram, but to have reversed the meaning.

HOLMES V. M. DENNIS 3d

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> "Les antiquitez de Rome, leurs sources latines et italiennes," *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux: Bulletin italien*, I (1901), 187-99. There is here only a vague allusion on p. 187.

<sup>2</sup> Joachim du Bellay und Horaz, *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, CXII (1904), 80-93.

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*The Cambridge Ancient History*. Edited by S. A. COOK, Litt.D.; F. E. ADCOCK, M.A.; and M. P. CHARLESWORTH, M.A. Vol. VIII, *Rome and the Mediterranean, 218-133 B.C.* Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. Pp. xxv+840 and maps, plans, and tables. 35s. \$9.50.

The appearance of a new volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* is always a real event. The present volume forms no exception to the rule. The period covered is relatively short, but it is extremely complex. It calls for an account of Rome and of her foreign affairs during the most important era of expansion. It likewise calls for an account of the various states and civilizations that came into contact or conflict with Rome. As a whole, the task has been adequately performed.

The volume commences with a chapter on Polybius by Glover. The other chapters are of two kinds, those devoted primarily to narrative history and those devoted to descriptions of culture, institutions, and social and economic conditions. The two most important sections of the narrative history are Hallward's three chapters on the Second Punic War and Holleaux's three chapters covering Rome's relations with the Hellenistic states to the settlement with Antiochus the Great. The thread of the narrative is then taken up by Benecke, who in two chapters traces Rome's later relations with Macedonia and Greece to the dissolution of the Achaean League. The scene then shifts to the west with Schulten's account of the Romans in Spain and Tenney Frank's two chapters on Italy and Rome in the period between Hannibal and the Gracchi. This is followed by a chapter on the Latin literature of the period by Duff and one on Roman religion and philosophy by Bailey. The next chapter, an account of the fall of Carthage by Hallward and Charlesworth, marks somewhat of a return to narrative history though Charlesworth's contribution is an epilogue containing a description of Carthaginian institutions and culture and an estimate of the historical significance of Carthage. The next five chapters are devoted to regional history and descriptions. They include a chapter by E. R. Bevan on Syria and the Jews, one by Kazarow on Thrace, and three chapters by Rostovtzeff on the Bosporan kingdom, on Pergamum, and on Rhodes, Delos, and Hellenistic commerce. The last chapter of the volume is a chapter by Ashmole devoted to Hellenistic art.

The name of B. L. Hallward, who has contributed the three chapters on the Hannibalic war, is new to the readers of the *Cambridge Ancient History*. This at first may cause some misgivings, but the reader soon will be glad to

welcome Mr. Hallward and will look forward with anticipation to his future work. He is bold in his interpretations, and though these may not always meet with approval, his account is well thought out and consistent. On the problem of the causes of the Second Punic War and of "war-guilt" Hallward is in essential agreement with Groag's study, *Hannibal als Politiker*, though Hallward deals more kindly with the Romans. He holds that "even Polybius was dominated by the Roman literature of justification." The story of the "wrath of the house of Barca" is rejected. It is held that the Roman alliance with Saguntum antedated the Ebro Treaty and was not invalidated by it. Yet Roman intrigues at Saguntum and Roman aggressiveness were responsible for the war. "Rome's policy at this time was not consistently imperialistic: it was often vacillating, timid, inert, but her malignity, in which now fear, now jealousy, now arrogant self-confidence, now greed of wealth and power was dominant, must have seemed beyond question." Hannibal's responsibility consisted merely in choosing the moment to strike back and thus fixing the time for the outbreak of the war. It is impossible to discuss here details of the account of the wars. It must suffice to say that, though the war with Philip V largely is reserved for Holleaux, Hallward succeeds in presenting the war as a general conflict with many theaters of warfare. The tremendous effort required from Rome is brought out by giving close attention to the number of troops involved in the various fields. Occasionally the author gets lost in the details, as when he has Hannibal move south from Grumentum to Venusia (p. 94) or when he places Hannibal's last resistance in Italy "in the heel of Italy" (p. 103). Such slips, however, are rare.

The editors are to be congratulated upon their success in inducing Maurice Holleaux to continue his account of Rome's relations with the Hellenistic states. His general interpretation can be anticipated by those acquainted with his earlier work, and this interpretation will not win universal approval. Yet it is doubtful whether a more satisfactory or more brilliant interpreter of the period can be found. Holleaux possesses to a rare degree the ability to interpret sympathetically the point of view of both or all parties to a contest and make their actions seem natural and intelligible. Philip V is represented as impetuous and selfish and, at times, brutal, but he is drawn with appreciation for his ability and an understanding of the difficulties of the problems with which he had to deal. His better side is revealed in his efforts to defend his allies. The famous "change of heart" attributed to him by Polybius meant little more than that he cut loose from the leading strings of Aratus. In the "disgraceful agreement" between him and Antiochus neither king was sincere, but Philip did nothing to offend Rome, and when the Second Macedonian War came, it was simply because the Senate so willed. Antiochus III is represented as a statesman aiming at the restoration of the Seleucid Empire. "Master of himself, unseduced by fantastic hopes, shrewdly calculating what the moment and his power allowed, he aimed only at the possible." He had no thoughts of aggression against Rome and could see no reason for the interfer-

ence of the Romans in the domestic affairs of his empire. Even after the repulse of his offer of a treaty of friendship and after the interference of Roman envoys in Asia, he was reluctant to go to war. His failure in Greece is in part attributed to his aversion to play the demagogue and his reluctance to "liberate" Greece forcibly. In his Greek venture he made mistakes but did not show any lack of energy. Luck was on the side of Rome and against him, and his mistakes never went unpunished. As for the Romans, their success throughout was based on fear, and their methods were by no means above reproach. "Rome, through her compact with Aetolia, was to treat mercilessly, as enemies, Greeks whom she could charge with no hostile act, and whose only crime was to be allies, and, till then, ineffective allies, of Philip." The later policy of Rome was largely dictated by fear of Antiochus. It was this fear that caused them to attack Philip in 200 and the same fear that dominated their policy toward Antiochus himself. They failed to understand that "he was sincere when he declared that he cherished no hostile designs against Rome." As to the settlements after the wars, Rome was generous in her treatment of Greece, and Flaminius was sincere in his efforts to arrange a settlement. In Asia, likewise, Rome acted with defense in view and showed no tendency toward imperialism.

The other chapters of the volume must be treated more briefly. Benecke's account of the later relations of Rome with the Hellenistic states forms a good continuation of Holleaux. As a whole, the Roman policy is defended. Rome did not wish to foment trouble or to go to extremes, though the harmful effects of her treatment of the Seleucids and of Rhodes are pointed out. In Schulten's account of Spain the many troubles of the Romans appear due to their greed and oppression, and their rule is characterized as brutal. Frank's account of Rome and Italy in this period is interesting, as is all his work. Only a few points will be noticed. The author believes that there is evidence to justify the statement of Polybius that the Celts largely disappeared from the Po Valley; he indicates that there was a connection between colonization on the Gallic frontier and the scarcity of men for the development of South Italy; he reiterates his theories that cereal culture did not decline in Italy in the second century, and that the Romans did not learn methods of agriculture from Carthage. Meanwhile, "the Roman government drifted without pronounced intentions into the habit of treating the Italian allies as subjects" but on the whole showed moderation. In foreign policy the influence of Cato caused a swing away from the old liberal policy. With regard to the chapters on literature and on philosophy and religion, the reviewer can say little more than that he found them interesting. Bailey's statement that "the start of 'Sibylline influence' must be placed before its first intervention in 493 B.C." (p. 451) suggests to the reviewer an excessive confidence in our accounts of early Roman history. Chapter xv, on the fall of Carthage, contains several noteworthy elements. Hallward's account of Hannibal's last year in Carthage is excellent. His account of Masinissa lays emphasis on his work as an "agent of civiliza-

tion" in Numidia. At the end of the chapter Charlesworth contributes an account of the Carthaginian constitution and a general estimate of Carthaginian culture. Though brief, this account atones somewhat for sins of omission in earlier volumes.

The series of chapters on the countries of the eastern Mediterranean are important and welcome. Here a notable omission is Egypt, but that country has probably been reserved for a later volume. Kazarow's account of Thrace is decidedly welcome, though it makes the reader fully as conscious of our ignorance as of our knowledge. The reader is, however, particularly indebted to Rostovtzeff for his three chapters. The reviewer is inclined to think that the chapter on the Bosporan kingdom is the most successful of the three. The reader's interest is stimulated at the outset by a statement of the importance of the kingdom, and once aroused the interest is never permitted to lag. If the other two chapters seem less successful, that is due more to the nature of the available material than to the author. Frequently it is necessary to fall back on conjecture or inference from the usage of other periods or districts. The basis for a statement concerning the trierarchs at Rhodes (p. 636) is a casual reference in Aristotle's *Politics*, which obviously refers to an earlier period. It is regrettable that it was necessary to give as an illustration of the Rhodian *cursus honorum* a career belonging to the time of the First Mithridatic War rather than to the period of the independence of Rhodes. Concerning his sketch of Hellenistic commerce the author remarks: "What is offered here is merely a sketch pointing out problems rather than suggesting solutions." It is a sad comment on the attitude of many toward the ancient world that Rostovtzeff finds it necessary to refute once more a theory that ought to have been obsolete long ago, the theory "about the ancient world living in conditions of primitive house-economy." The study of the group of chapters just discussed as well as the last chapter of the volume on Hellenistic art (including architecture and town-planning) is facilitated by the fact that the third volume of plates is out and that references to the plates are given in footnotes. The plates for Thrace and the Bosporus fortunately are particularly numerous.

On the side of the technical make-up of the volume it may be noted that the amount of references given in footnotes and parentheses still remains moderate, but that they are enough to be very useful, though many may desire more full annotation. The proofreading has been careful, as we are accustomed to find it in this work. The reviewer, however, feels that there is decided room for improvement in one respect. This is in the maps. The reader has a right to expect that important places mentioned in the text shall be shown on the maps illustrating the field in question. To attempt to enumerate all omissions is impossible, but there is probably no map that does not fall short somewhere. Only a few glaring examples will be given. On page 318 Schulten states that from Ocilis "Nobilior marched against Numantia by way of Almazan." If the reader turns to Map 11, he will find no Almazan and no

Ocilis except in Africa. Map 8 does not show Magnesia ad Sipylum, not to mention Gordium, Stratoniceia, Halicarnassus, and other cities. There are enough other omissions to constitute a serious shortcoming. This criticism is made with the thought that the *Cambridge Ancient History* is such an important and excellent work that it is a pity not to avoid defects of the kind that can be removed by means of more careful editorial attention to these particular details. It would also be well to have a few more maps. In this respect the various sections have been given uneven treatment. Map 8 is not sufficient to take care of the Near East.

This is not the place to go into a detailed discussion of the merits or demerits of the general plan of the work. It may be noted, however, that the plan makes it almost inevitable that some feature or point of view should be neglected. It is regrettable that the beginnings of Roman historiography should receive no attention except a couple of pages in the general chapter on Latin literature. Probably this will be rectified in the next volume. It is also difficult in such a period as the one before us not to subordinate everything too much to the question of power and international politics. This has largely been rectified by such chapters as those of Kazarow and Rostovtzeff. Yet there is one notable shortcoming. Greece, in spite of the breadth of the treatment of Holleaux and Benecke, inevitably appears chiefly as a complication in the relations of Rome, Macedon, and the Seleucid Empire. It is probably just to say that the Greeks of the time completely misjudged the situation and what the future was to bring, but this is not surprising when it is remembered that many believe that Rome herself was late to recognize that she was destined to rule in Greece and Asia. In any case there were enough elements of interest in Greece proper to make the country deserve special treatment along with Thrace and Pergamum. To deny it such treatment is to pass judgment too exclusively on the basis of power and success. After all, it is equally important to attempt to understand what the world was like to the people that lived in it.

Another result of the general plan is that much of the work of co-ordination and interpretation is left to the reader. This was less true in Volume VII, in which the period was interpreted in an introductory chapter by Ferguson. It is possible that the editors hoped to have something of this nature in Glover's chapter on Polybius. If so, the chapter is a failure. It is a pleasant introduction to Polybius for the general reader but no more. The reviewer will not attempt to supply the missing interpretation but wishes to discuss briefly the treatment of the old vexed problem of Roman imperialism. The accounts of Hallward and Schulten lead to the conclusion that in the west Rome was grasping and aggressive, while the account of Holleaux leads to the conclusion that in the east Rome acted on the defensive and blundered into empire. Leaving aside the question of whether this is correct, there is nothing inconsistent in the resulting picture. It would be perfectly natural for a power to attempt to acquire control of newer and less-developed countries without



dreaming of subjecting the older and more highly organized states. It would also be possible that there was a group of leaders whose cupidity was aroused by the mineral wealth of Spain, even if the country as a whole was too undeveloped economically and too agricultural-minded to attempt to compete with older commercial and industrial interests.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Tradition and Design in the "Iliad."* By C. M. BOWRA. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930. Pp. viii+278.

The book seems intended to place a new view of the Homeric controversy before a circle of readers wider than the professed students of the problem. England is fortunate in possessing those to whom such a book can appeal, and it is well for their interests to be served. They will enjoy this book, no doubt, for it is skilfully constructed, and makes quite agreeable reading. It is to be praised also for its freedom from the *naïveté*, the dogmatism, and the antiscientific bias that are to be found so frequently associated with the Unitarian label.

The author sees that there is a problem, and is willing to discuss it. His position, indicated already in the title, seeks to avoid extremes and is described (p. 1) as excluding "on the one hand . . . the view that the completed poem is largely the result of chance and caprice,<sup>1</sup> and on the other hand the view that the poet was completely his own master and the *Iliad* is what it is simply because Homer chose so to compose it."

The topics treated may be suggested by a quotation of the chapter headings: "Tradition and Design" (pp. 1-26); "The Origins of the Epic" (pp. 27-52); "The Hexameter" (pp. 53-66); "Some Primitive Elements" (pp. 67-86); "Repetitions and Contradictions" (pp. 87-113); "The Similes" (pp. 114-28); "The Language" (pp. 129-55); "The Historical Background" (pp. 156-91); "The Characters" (pp. 192-214); "Homeric Theology" (pp. 215-33); "Homer and the Heroic Age" (pp. 234-50); "Homer's Time and Place" (pp. 251-78).

The author's strength lies in his literary appreciations, and these constitute the best and the largest portions of the book. "It is now possible," he says (p. 1), "to take the *Iliad* as we have it and to consider it as poetry." That is a legitimate field of inquiry, and how much can be accomplished in it has just been shown for the *Odyssey* by Mr. Woodhouse.<sup>2</sup> It would have been well, I

<sup>1</sup> But whose view, in the present century at least, can be so described? Cf. a vigorous paragraph anticipating such a description by W. J. Woodhouse, *The Composition of Homer's "Odyssey"* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930), p. 237.

<sup>2</sup> His is a remarkable book, one that it is difficult to put down unfinished. There is matter for disagreement, of course, notably the translations, for which the original can however, be substituted. I believe that more can be done with the problem than Mr. Woodhouse thinks possible, but I shall recommend his book as an approach; and it is a pleasure to have in English a book that can be so recommended. Cf. also the sympathetic review by Paul Shorey, *Class. Phil.*, XXVI (1931), 111-13.

think, had Mr. Bowra similarly limited his discussion. He declares that he lacks "any full confidence" in his treatment of the historical background; while he disqualifies himself as a linguist by printing (p. 133) that *εἶναι* is for *ἔμναι*, itself a contracted form of *ἔμμεναι*.<sup>1</sup> Nor can I find much of value in his chapter on "The Hexameter," which could have gained by an acquaintance<sup>1</sup> with Sturtevant's article, "The Doctrine of Caesura, a Philological Ghost," *AJPh*, XLV (1924), 329-50. I shall disregard these chapters and discuss only the plan of considering the *Iliad* in its present form as poetry.

Its execution is marred by a number of slight blemishes. "Achilles cannot restrain" Patroclus (p. 20). Did not restrain is all that the text warrants.—"When Odysseus and Aias find Achilles in his tent" (p. 32). This excludes Phoenix, who figures in the present form of the *Iliad*.—Patroclus is "waiting for Achilles to stop that he may pick up the song and continue it" (p. 32). An inference is added to what is stated in the text.—"When Agamemnon finds Diomedes slacking before battle he tells him a story of Tydeus, how his rapidity of movement circumvented his enemies" (p. 85). The author makes a neat point, but of rapidity of movement there is nothing in Homer's story.—Nestor harangues "his son after the chariot race" (p. 86). In Homer this speech (Ψ 627-50) is to Achilles, that to Antilochus is before the race.—"Herodotus says of Homer that he only once contradicts himself" (p. 96). The historian's remark (ii. 116) means that no passage contradicts the view that Paris returned via Egypt and Sidonia.—"The feats of Neoptolemus" are located (p. 183) in the country of Telephus.—"When the embassy leaves him, he has almost made up his mind to sail away in the morning" (p. 196). Spoken after sunset *ἄπριον* means what we call "the day after tomorrow." For practical reasons it is the earliest time possible, and the poet is for a moment playing with a motive of fiction—the pathos of a man's just missing his chance of safety. Achilles has tarried one day too long.—"Patroclus weeps for shame in the tent of Achilles" (p. 197). Neither motive nor locality stands in the text.—Achilles "fights the river god Scamander, till Hephaestus intervenes" (p. 199). As if the river god needed Hephaestus to save him.<sup>2</sup>—Apollo's warning (Υ 376-80) and Hector's speech (Υ 366-72) seem transposed (p. 201).—Nestor "is made to appear slightly laughable when his horse gets wounded in flight from Hector" (p. 207). The flight is from Zeus's thunderbolts, and Nestor did not participate in it, for his horse had been shot by Paris, apparently while still facing the foe. I can find nothing laughable in the episode.—When Odysseus "wrestles with the dull-witted Aias, he whispers to

<sup>1</sup> The author's reading of periodicals seems limited mostly to British journals. Of the rest of "the vast literature on the *Iliad*" he has read only as much "as time has allowed" (p. viii), and his citations do not go very far beyond the larger works and a few German dissertations. Mr. Woodhouse's course seems preferable—to cite no modern work at all.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 81: "It is right that Achilles should be called *ποδάρετης* . . . when he pursues the River God." Unluckily, too, the epithet is applied in the phrase, *δοσάκευ δ' ὀρηγσετε* . . . *σῆματι ἐναντίβιον*.

his opponent that they must make it a sham contest, and Aias must let him throw him. Aias does, but when it comes to his turn to be thrown, Odysseus does not keep the bargain" (p. 208). The whole interpretation is fanciful, but it is sufficient to point out that the "whisper" on which it is based is made by Aias, and not by Odysseus.—"Hysterical" does not seem a well-selected adjective to apply (p. 211) to Hecuba's speech (X 82 ff.).—Achilles "swears an oath with the sacrifice of a boar that he has never defiled Briseis" (p. 218). "When Zeus wants to frighten the other gods and goddesses he threatens to hang a golden rope from heaven and fasten them all to it" (p. 223). In the text Zeus challenges the god to a tug-of-war, if they doubt his supremacy.—"The fight" between Menelaus and Paris "closes owing to the treachery of Pandarus" (p. 228). Such is not the story of our present text.—"Morality demanded reverent treatment of the old, and neglect of such treatment was punished. To illustrate this point Phoenix tells the story of his own guilt" (p. 228). This is not the motif for the introduction of the story in Homer.—"When Achilles drives out to war, he speaks to his horses and tells them to save the body of Patroclus. Quite naturally the horse Zanthus shakes his head . . ." (p. 247).

These matters are in themselves trifles, but some of them show a tendency to allow Fancy to embroider the text, and for the interpreter of the *Iliad* as poetry to become a *Nachdichter*. Neither can I agree that this is the proper attitude for an interpreter nor can I always admire the *Nachdichtung*. This tendency can be recognized in more important matters.

Most important is the view (p. 17) that "the theme" of the *Iliad* "is how Achilles' temper leads him both to disaster and to moral degradation." Everything is said (*ibid.*) to depend upon it: "Only so can we see that the *Iliad*, in spite of its many strands and patterns, is essentially a unity." The unity that is in the *Iliad* does not seem to me to rest on so precarious a footing, nor can I find in the close of the *Iliad* an effort to depict a morally degraded man. Discussion would, however, take too much space, and probably lead in the end merely to the undebatable oppositions of tastes and interests.

I turn to the treatment of the "conventional epithet" (pp. 81-84), where fancy has full play, although much to check it could have been learned from Milman Parry.<sup>1</sup>

The climax is the treatment of *φυσίζοος αἶα* (Γ 243) in the sentimental strain ("the effect is pure pathos") familiar from the discussions by Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, Jebb. But the etymology of *φυσίζοος* is clear (cf. Bechtel, *Lexilogus*, p. 148), and it is a synonym of *ζείδωρος*, the last and first elements of each being identical. The possibility of pathos comes only when, by popular etymology, an association with *ζωή* is established.<sup>2</sup> Another example is the

<sup>1</sup> *L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*. Paris, 1928.

<sup>2</sup> To assume that this was early enough to affect Homer would be an *ad hoc* hypothesis. There would remain even then the broader difficulties, discussed by Parry; cf. esp. p. 156.

fancy that Athene addresses Pandarus as *Λυκάονος νιὲ δαίφρων* (Δ 93) in order to lead up to the poet's comment (Δ 104) *τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πείθεν*. In the *Iliad* *δαίφρων* means "warlike"; only in the *Odyssey* does it have the sense "wise," which is needed for the supposed contrast with *ἄφρονι*.<sup>1</sup>

Two other examples may lead on to another criticism. Of "the famous catalogue of Zeus' love-affairs [Ξ 315-28]" we are told (p. 74):

. . . Its presence in the *Iliad* is entirely comic. Zeus solemnly enumerates his loves to Hera with the self-satisfaction of an experienced philanderer. The comedy is enhanced by the trap into which the old boaster is being led by his wife; the father of the Gods, who is so proud of his conquests, is being caught on his favorite ground.

I can see here only a flight of the interpreter's imagination, for I can find neither in the text nor in the context the slightest indication that the passage was planned for such an effect.

On page 92 it is said:

. . . There are the two similes for the arming of Hector and of Paris, where certainly that concerning Hector, which comes later, loses much of its interest because we have had the other lines before. But on closer examination there is more in it than this. When Paris arms, he is acting rather against his character as a frivolous and none too courageous fighter. He puts on the heroic panoply of war, and we are interested to see how the new part will suit him. The details of the arming help to stir our curiosity about his behaviour in his new rôle, and make us wonder how he will acquit himself in it. Hector is the antithesis of this. His prowess and character are proved. We know that whatever happens he will acquit himself like a man. So when he arms himself, our feelings are quite different. Each runs into the fight like a stallion broken loose from its stall. In identical words the cowardly Paris and the "preux chevalier" Hector advance to their different fates. The conclusion must be that the repetition is deliberate.

Again I find this interpretation ingenious but fanciful; the contrast is modern work. "The details of Paris' arming" are not given in connection with this simile (Z 506-11) by Homer at all. What he says is simply *ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ* (Z 504); the details have been inopportunistically remembered from the third book. Nor does Hector "arm himself" in connection with the other (O 263-68) simile, nor in any other part of the *Iliad*. Neither of these heroes is advancing to his fate in the present form of the *Iliad*, where Hector is not killed until the next day, and Paris not at all. The idea of their contrasting fates is a recollection of Bethe's reconstruction of an earlier poem, *Hektors Abschied*, which has nothing to do with the repetition of the simile in the *Iliad* as it now stands. If we are to conclude that "the repetition is deliberate," we must certainly do so for some other reason.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bechtel, *op. cit.*, s.v. The etymology \**dasi*:-Skt. *dasra*- (Boisacq, Liddell and Scott) is morphologically attractive, but fails to account for the distribution of meanings in Homer.

Even if this reason can be found the situation will not be as Mr. Bowra would have it. The "deliberate repetition" of the entire simile cannot be the choice of a poet of the eighth century B.C. He may have chosen to repeat two of its six lines, but the man (or men) who chose to add the rest did not live earlier than the sixth century.<sup>1</sup> The case of the Leporello catalogue is pretty much the same, although the evidence for the existence of a text without it is not so immediate.<sup>2</sup>

The present form of the *Iliad* can be considered as poetry, that is, one can expose himself to this stimulus, observe and record his reactions, compare them with the reactions he gets from other poems, and state the results of his comparisons. It is an interesting form of activity, and I have no wish to question its value. But if one wishes to go farther and draw inferences about persons and facts contemporary with the composition of the poem, the present form of the *Iliad* is no adequate basis. We know quite definitely the somewhat different form standardized by Aristarchus in the second century B.C., and we can see at many points how this had changed from the form established in the days of Pisistratus. When this earliest text is known it must be followed by the man who wishes to make historical inferences, and elsewhere he must be constantly on his guard against the possibility that there have been similar changes. There are risks of error, of courses, in attempting to do this; but there is, as the examples cited show, the certainty of greater error in refusing to attempt it. Mr. Bowra has chosen to stand upon the present form of the *Iliad*; that is his right unquestionably, but he should then have limited himself to the consideration of it as poetry.

G. M. BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

---

*La vie de l'Empereur Julien.* Par J. BIDEZ. Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres." Paris, 1930. Pp. 408. Fr. 25.

Julian has had his proper share of biographers, hostile, sympathetic, merely sentimental, and even resolutely impartial. But in spite of all their pains, to the general reader they have given no clear comprehension of his complex and contradictory personality. No positive epithet has replaced, or ever will, the negative and wholly insufficient label bestowed on him by the church. The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my *External Evidence*, pp. 156-57.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 147. The lines were athetized, however, by Aristophanes and Aristarchus. In the last five years I have come to attach much more importance to such facts, and I am convinced that at the start athetesis was restricted to lines that were (or seemed to be) badly attested, and that down to Aristarchus it went little, if at all, beyond the limits thus imposed. Whether our fragmentary and confused sources are sufficient to permit a demonstration of this is doubtful. But certainly one who excludes all athetized lines will come nearer to the sixth century form of Homer than he who uncritically accepts them.

title "apostate" indicates his most conspicuous failure, and the general reader is seldom aware that he spent the greater part of his brief reign in trying to reform and pull into shape the disintegrating Roman Empire. What he needed was time, and fate allowed him to rule for only twenty months. If he had postponed his fatal Persian campaign or had returned from it in triumph and founded a center of Mithraic worship, perhaps at Tarsus, just to spite the frivolous citizens of Antioch, it is quite possible that he would have succeeded in replacing the new religion by the soldier's favorite cult which had been that of his ancestors. Even if he had ultimately failed, like Ikhnaton in a somewhat similar attempt in the fourteenth century B.C., his epithet might have been "sun-worshiper," which would have at least conveyed to posterity a clearer idea of what he aspired to do.

Julian has never before had a biographer so well fitted as is Professor Bidez to comprehend and present lucidly how it came about that such an individual, born and bred in Asia in that age and time, subjected to the conflicting influences of Christian and pagan teachers, decided as a mere boy of twenty to play a leading part in the Hellenization of the Eastern Empire. In his chapter entitled "Le reveil de l'Hellénisme" Professor Bidez gives an admirable summary of the renaissance of Hellenism in the fourth century, and clearly distinguishes the various rôles played in that movement by the sophists, the neo-Platonists, especially Iamblichus whose mysticism dominated the *Hymn to Helios* which contains Julian's fullest expression of his own creed, and the thaumaturgists, such as Maximus of Ephesus, who fostered his yearning for direct evidence of the supernatural—for oracles, dreams, and visions that might assure him that he was the chosen instrument of Mithras.

Professor Bidez makes more use of the Emperor's letters, and with more precise knowledge of their chronology than any previous biographer, explains his Zionism, and shows clearly, I should say for the first time, why and when Julian, exasperated by the disappointments of the first months of his reign, changed his policy of tolerance to one of persecution; that is to say, after his arrival in Antioch in the summer of 362. The notes are, of course, invaluable to the student, and the general reader will find in this volume a fascinating account of the entanglements and cross-currents—political, philosophic, literary, and religious—of the perplexing fourth Christian century, and of the reasons why Julian's attempt to control them failed at every point.

Students of Julian's works who have been puzzled as to the precise identity and functions of the two Sallusts will note that Professor Bidez (p. 378) now agrees with Seeck that the Sallust who became prefect of the East was Julian's friend and counselor in Gaul. The Index to the Bidez-Cumont edition of the *Letters* (1922), pages 310-11, should accordingly be re-written. There are few misprints, but on page 89 I note "Annie Bezan"; on the same page note 19 is wrongly numbered 20.

WILMER CAVE WRIGHT



*Iphigénie à Aulis: Edition classique, avec une Introduction sur le théâtre grec et sur Euripide, un Commentaire et un Index des Noms Propres.* PAR A. WILLEM. 2d ed. Liège: H. Dessain, 1930.

This little volume contains much matter, especially for the undergraduate student of the Greek drama. Its purpose is to give in convenient form all the material necessary for an appreciation of the play, chiefly from a literary point of view. The Introduction consists of three parts (1) a quite complete survey of the Greek drama, its origin, and its structure, and a description with illustrations and diagram of the Greek theatre; (2) a brief but entirely sufficient account of the things known or said about Euripides and his works, with a very reasonable appreciation of the peculiar qualities of his art and his ideas; (3) a discussion of the *Iphigenia*, its sources and characteristics, with a clear and full outline of the plot and action.

All of this material is presented in a simple way with a minimum of technicalities, but all essential terms are defined and explained. Discussions of doubtful and less essential points are given in finer print to be omitted or included at the student's discretion. Disputed points are set forth without any attempt to force a solution or uphold a particular theory. The discussion of the metres of the drama is very brief but for that very reason not likely to confuse the student—though the writer might have mentioned that the dactyl sometimes substituted for an iamb in the dialogue is only an apparent one.

In the section on the art of Euripides the pathetic and the realistic qualities of his drama are particularly stressed, and he is called in this respect a precursor of Shakespeare and the romanticists and also of the later comedy. The discussion of the authenticity of the prologue and the concluding portion of the *Iphigenia* is sane and lucid.

In the text each section is prefaced by a very brief explanation or summary and the metre of the scene is indicated. The notes are conveniently printed at the foot of the page. They are intended to assist the student in understanding the text, and difficult and idiomatic phrases are explained and translated, but there are also frequent references to other plays and many interesting and enlightening comments. A comparison and contrast with the *Iphigenia* of Racine runs through the whole commentary, bringing out in excellent fashion the realistic and colloquial quality of Euripides' play as contrasted with the dignified classicism of the French dramatist. The whole tone of the commentary is charmingly informal and conversational, making one feel that the commentator is doing in his notes what a skilful teacher would do orally.

An alphabetical Index of all proper names follows. The text is in general that of the edition of H. Weil (Hachette, 1899). There are no notes on the text in the footnotes, but a table at the close of the volume gives all the readings that differ from Weil's text—which is also a convenience for the young student or the rapid reader. There is a brief but good Bibliography on Greek tragedy, Euripides, and the theatre. Another, perhaps insignificant



but attractive, point of the volume is the clear and excellent printing and arrangement of the page, which is a boon to those readers for whom the book is intended.

STELLA LANGE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Excavations at Olynthus*, Part III: "The Coins Found at Olynthus in 1928." By DAVID M. ROBINSON. "The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 11. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1931. Pp. 129. Pls. 28. \$10.

*Excavations at Olynthus*, Part IV: "The Terra-Cottas of Olynthus Found in 1928." By DAVID M. ROBINSON. "The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 12. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1931. Pp. 105. Pls. 62. \$10.

The excavation at Olynthus, carried on during a single season by Professor Robinson, is remarkable for its yield and still more for the promptness with which the results are made available for study. It is rare indeed for four volumes of scholarly description to appear within three years after a season's work, and the material from many campaigns is never published so fully at all. Digging an ancient site is great fun, but that is all, unless the results are laid before the scholarly world. In a prompt and fully illustrated publication many deficiencies may be forgiven. In these volumes, however, the author's all-embracing erudition is no less remarkable than his energy.

In excavations of historic (as opposed to prehistoric) sites coins are the backbone of chronology. They are particularly important at Olynthus, where various discoveries might suggest a later date than 348, the year of the destruction by Philip. Professor Robinson maintains that the city was not rebuilt, and the coins bear him out. In the total of 966 coins there are two that belong to the latter part of the fourth century and one of the third; it appears from this insignificant number that the city was not then inhabited and that several other coins, of issues which have usually been considered later than 348, are in fact earlier. As would be expected at Olynthus, coins of the Chalcidic League are predominant: 647 were found. Forty-eight came from Potidaea and prove that it was rebuilt after the Peloponnesian War. There are 67 Bottiaean coins with Chalcidic types, which lead the author to the conclusion that the Bottiaeans, with their own mints, lived on the south hill at Olynthus. This hypothesis, at first sight somewhat remarkable, is said to be supported by "pottery and other finds." Other nearby towns are well represented, as are the Macedonian kings. The coins from more distant cities give hints about the commercial relations of Olynthus that are sometimes surprising; there are only three coins from Athens, none from Corinth, eight

from Gortyna in Crete. A number of coin types are made known for the first time. Among the discoveries are two small hoards of silver coins and some thirty unstruck bronze flans.

For the illustrations photographs were made directly from the coins. Some of the more important are shown also, on the last two plates, by photographs of the casts. In comparison, the illustrations from casts are rather more satisfactory than the others, but some details appear more distinctly in the coins than in the casts. It is in keeping with the character of the publication that many coins in poor condition, which would be omitted from many books, are included in the plates; and that only 135 are uncatalogued because of their hopeless state.

The catalogue of terra-cottas contains 422 items. Of these the first 251 were found together and evidently were votive offerings at a temple which were discarded. Most of them are female masks. To judge from the style, they were scattered over a considerable period. The author suggests that most of the *cache* is earlier than the destruction of the town by Artabazus in 479. This seems too early: even the most archaic pieces do not look much earlier than the sculptures of the west pediment at Aegina, and most of them are surely later than any of the pre-Persian sculptures of the Acropolis. At the end of the catalogue are placed thirteen molds from which figurines would be made. All thirteen were found in one room of what was evidently a terracotta factory. Both molds and casts from them are well illustrated and form a series of great interest. One of them (No. 412) is very odd: a mold for a beautiful head, with a caricatured face modeled on the outside. (But what is Fig. 412A?)

The miscellaneous terra-cottas cover a range in time from 600 or earlier to 348, and several of them would have been dated still later if found elsewhere. There are several nude female busts and seminude female figures (Nos. 330 ff). Number 358 is a plaque with a free but unmistakable imitation of the "Athena Parthenos" of Phidias. This is likely to become well known; it is one of the earliest imitations and is one of the very few that show the "Nike" (too large) distinctly; it does *not* show a pillar supporting the right hand. There are several naturalistic and comic figures, including some negroes, which would usually be thought Hellenistic. Perhaps the most interesting novelty is a large bust (No. 409), which seems to belong to the fifth century. For the action of the "lady" mentioned on page 87 see *Jahrbuch*, 1929, page 174.

Work at Olynthus has been resumed this year, and additions to this admirable series of volumes will doubtless appear soon.

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## BREVIORA

[The managing editor establishes this subdepartment because of the difficulty of procuring substantial critical reviews of all books, and the impossibility if they were found of printing them in our limited space. It is believed that brief but fair *comptes rendus* will prove more useful than a mere biographical notice. Contributions to this department should never exceed a page, and a paragraph is preferable.]

*Auguste Couat: Alexandrian Poetry under the First Three Ptolemies, 324-222 B.C.* With a supplementary chapter by EMILE CAHEN. Translated by JAMES LOEB. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1931.

Dr. Loeb has added to the debt which all lovers of the classics owe him by another admirable translation of an indispensable work of French scholarship. In the ideal university all graduate students of classics as a matter of course read French, German, and English in addition to Latin and Greek. In practice only a few do, in America or elsewhere. I have found Dr. Loeb's translations of Décharme, Croiset, and Legrand of great help in my teaching and have no doubt that many teachers will find this version of Couat no less useful. Couat wrote many years ago, but his readable analyses and fine appreciations have not grown antiquated. And the new matter which recent papyri finds have brought is competently discussed in Professor Emile Cahen's supplementary chapter written at Dr. Loeb's request.

The book as a whole then is the most convenient and attractive treatment of the entire subject available for the American student.<sup>1</sup>

PAUL SHOREY

*Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden.* Leitung: OTTO GRADENWITZ. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1931. Pp. x+127. M. 12.

This valuable addition to the research equipment of students of papyrology is fittingly dedicated to the late Bernard P. Grenfell, and in its preparation Professor Gradenwitz had the expert assistance of Professor F. Bilabel and others. The Index is based on Preisigke's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* but includes also the vocabulary of later papyrus publications up to 1928 and some words from unpublished documents as well as those omitted by Preisigke as too common or too indefinite. The words are arranged according to the alphabetical order of their last letters. Those not in Preisigke's *Wörterbuch* are starred in the general list and are also arranged in a separate list in normal alphabetical order with references to their sources. A third list contains the abbreviated or incomplete words. There is no reason to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. reviews of Körte, *Class. Phil.*, XXV (1930), 95-96; Wilamowitz, *ibid.*, XX (1925), 75-77; Powell, *ibid.*, pp. 348-49; Powell and Barber, *ibid.*, XXIV (1929), 305-7.

doubt that this work will, as its director hopes, prove of great help in the reconstruction of difficult readings in both old and new papyri and will thoroughly justify the labor expended on its preparation.

A. E. R. BOAK

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

*Plato, The Republic, with an English Translation.* By PAUL SHOREY.  
Vol. I: Books i-v. "Loeb Classical Library Series." London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

We have not yet been able to discover any appreciable errors to gloat over in this volume of the well-known "Loeb Series" except the misprint "Archedamus" on page xxxvii. But the lynx-eyed Professor Roger Jones or reviewers whom the author has himself reviewed probably will. There are several things that we could wish were more felicitously expressed. Perhaps the youthful author will do better in the second volume. We hope so. There are some heresies which will doubtless meet with due animadversion from reviewers who have studied Plato longer and more critically than this translator. Those who agree with his point of view may be more lenient; cf. *habent sua fata libelli, aliter non fit, Avite, liber*, "who the little book for the pleasure with which we wrote him and the studious youth at which we dedicate him," "the sisters three and other such odd branches of learning."

P. S.

*Catalogue of the Coins Found at Corinth, 1925.* By ALFRED R. BELLINGER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930. Bound in paper. Pp. 95. Pls. 2. \$2.00.

Here are catalogued 1,305 coins found in the campaign of 1925. "About eight hundred additional pieces had to be rejected as hopeless." Autonomous Greek coins are strangely few, and it is difficult to believe that this lot of coins is fairly representative in that respect: Mummius surely did not dig up the ground and carry away the lost coins. Greek and Roman coins together amount to only 428; 693 are Byzantine and the rest are well scattered, including three English of the thirteenth century and one Polish of the sixteenth. The long series suggests a great deal of history, as does also the gap beginning after Constans II and corresponding to the period of Slavic dominion.

This *Catalogue* reaches the highest standard of numismatic work. The Introduction, occupying less than three pages, contains a good statement in behalf of publications of coins from excavations. Mrs. Bellinger attended to the cleaning of the coins and contributes a brief account of the method that she used. There are good indexes. One might have desired more illustrations, but it is a pleasant novelty to find an archaeological book for two dollars, and plates are expensive.

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

*Descensus Averno: Fourteen Woodcuts Reproduced from Sebastian Brant's "Virgil," Strasburg, MDII.* Elucidated and provided with a Foreword by ANNA COX BRINTON. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1930. \$3.50.

The content of this volume is sufficiently indicated by the title. These woodcuts made Brant's *Virgil* one of the most popular of the early picture-books, and it is easy to see why: for the time of Dürer they are not really fine woodcuts, but they are fine illustrations, omitting little and making everything clear and lively. Like other Renaissance woodcuts of classical subjects, they are diverting to the classicist especially because of the contemporary costume and detail. The reproductions are good and the "elucidations" are well written; the book is attractively got up and makes a charming Vergilian souvenir.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

*Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua, Vol. II: Meriamlik und Korykos: Zwei christliche Ruinenstätten des rauhen Kilikiens.* Aufnahmen von E. HERZFELD mit einem begleitenden Text von S. GUYER. "Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor," Vol. II. Manchester University Press, 1930. Pp. xviii+207. Figs. 207. 40s.

In this series it is proposed to describe and illustrate the monuments of Asia Minor which are visible above the ground. The undertaking is large but not immoderately difficult or expensive, and it answers an urgent need: things not concealed in the earth are likely to vanish rapidly and completely. For the classicist this volume contains little; for the student of Christian architecture, much. At Korykos there are indeed some considerable Roman remains, but they are only mentioned. The Christian remains are described more fully, it seems, than is contemplated for the series in general; both text and illustrations are excellent; and the material is rich in interest. There is a chapter on the general style of the architecture, in which Syrian, Byzantine, and Anatolian influences are distinguished, and a summary of the book in English.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

*Hannibal als Politiker.* By EDMUND GROAG. Wien: L. W. Seidel & Sohn, 1929. Pp. 158.

In the present study Groag presents an interpretation that challenges incisively interpretations that have been widely accepted, and he presents it in such a way that his views cannot be disregarded. Not only students specifically interested in Hannibal but all those interested in general in Rome's

foreign relations and in the much-discussed problem of Rome's aggressiveness or lack of aggressiveness outside of Italy must either accept his point of view or show reason for not doing so. He works with broad though probably not exhaustive knowledge of the literature of the subject. His footnotes are full and often quote the crucial passages from the sources. His account is well thought out and consistent. He comes to the conclusion that all sources are colored by hostility toward Hannibal, and so frequently present matters in a false light. Groag's own attempt at reconstruction results in an account highly favorable to Hannibal. In this he goes to surprising lengths. Many readers may follow him in placing the blame for the Second Punic War on Rome rather than on the Barcids and yet may balk when they are asked to regard Hannibal as a champion of freedom and culture against a barbaric people dominated by a greedy and avaricious aristocracy and to believe that the only man to attempt to organize a co-operative defense of the Greek idea of liberty over against the barbaric Italian power was himself a Phoenician Semite and so a barbarian. It may be dangerous to state this phase of Groag's interpretation. To do so may frighten away readers, and that would be a pity, for the study deserves careful consideration.

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*On the Government of God: A Treatise Wherein Are Shown by Argument and by Examples Drawn from the Abandoned Society of the Times the Ways of GOD toward His Creatures.* Indited by SALVIAN. Translated by EVA M. SANFORD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930. \$3.75.

Miss Sanford's correct, readable, learnedly annotated, and interestingly introduced translation of Salvian adds to the Columbia series of records of civilization a valuable document—valuable, that is, to the scientific student of history to whom in his professional capacity literary values are irrelevant. The incorrigible classicist will find it difficult to suppress a hint of condescending intellectual snobbery toward a writer who denounces Socrates as the author of the licentious fifth book of the *Republic* and who requires eight books of verbiage and Old Testament quotations and examples to justify the ways of God to man after the sack of Rome and the fourfold devastation of Trèves. It is true that in the difficult application of his thesis to his own troublous times Salvian throws much light on the life of Gaul and the Roman Empire generally in the fifth century. Northern Africa, it seems, was a brothel which the Vandals as the instruments of the judgment of God scourged and cleansed, meriting their victories by the purity of their own morals which presented so edifying a contrast to the infamy of the Romans who put into practice the principles and the precepts of Socrates.

PAUL SHOREY

